arXiv:1610.07948v1 [cs.CR] 25 Oct 2016

Revocable Hierarchical Identity-Based Encryption from Multilinear Maps

Seunghwan Park* Dong Hoon Lee† Kwangsu Lee‡

Abstract

In identity-based encryption (IBE) systems, an efficient key delegation method to manage a large number of users and an efficient key revocation method to handle the dynamic credentials of users are needed. Revocable hierarchical IBE (RHIBE) can provide these two methods by organizing the identities of users as a hierarchy and broadcasting an update key for non-revoked users per each time period. To provide the key revocation functionality, previous RHIBE schemes use a tree-based revocation scheme. However, this approach has an inherent limitation such that the number of update key elements depends on the number of revoked users. In this paper, we propose two new RHIBE schemes in multilinear maps that use the public-key broadcast encryption scheme instead of using the tree-based revocation scheme to overcome the mentioned limitation. In our first RHIBE scheme, the number of private key elements and update key elements is reduced to $O(\ell)$ and $O(\ell)$ respectively where ℓ is the depth of a hierarchical identity. In our second RHIBE scheme, we can further reduce the number of private key elements from $O(\ell)$ to $O(1)$.

Keywords: Hierarchical identity-based encryption, Key revocation, Key delegation, Multilinear maps.

*Korea University, Seoul, Korea. Email: sgusa@korea.ac.kr.
†Korea University, Seoul, Korea. Email: donghlee@korea.ac.kr.
‡Sejong University, Seoul, Korea. Email: kwangsu@sejong.ac.kr.

1 Introduction

Identity-based encryption (IBE) is a specific type of public-key encryption (PKE) that uses an identity string of a user (e.g., e-mail address, phone number) as a public key to simplify the management of public keys [5, 28]. IBE can be extended to hierarchical IBE (HIBE) that supports the delegation of private keys by allowing a parent user to generate private keys of child users [14, 15]. For the deployment of IBE (or HIBE) in real environments, an efficient revocation mechanism is needed to handle dynamically changing credentials (private keys) of users. Revocable HIBE (RHIBE) is an extension of HIBE that provides both the delegation of private keys and the revocation of private keys. Although there already exists a revocable IBE (RIBE) scheme [2], it is not easy to directly apply the technique of RIBE to RHIBE since the key delegation of HIBE makes it hard to handle the revocation.

The first RHIBE scheme was proposed by Seo and Emura [25] that uses a tree-based revocation scheme of Naor, Naor, and Lotspiech [21] for the revocation functionality. To create an update key in this RHIBE scheme, a user who has a private key should retrieve all update keys of all ancestors. This method is called as history-preserving updates. After that, Seo and Emura proposed another RHIBE scheme via history-free updates [27]. In this RHIBE scheme via history-free updates, a user can simply create an update key after retrieving the update key of his parent only. By using this new approach, they also reduced the size of a private key from $O(\ell^2 \log N)$ to $O(\ell \log N)$ where ℓ is the depth of the identity and N is the maximum number of users in each level. Recently, Lee and Park proposed new RHIBE schemes with shorter private keys and update keys by removing the undesirable multiplicative factor ℓ from the size of private keys and update keys [18].

Although the progress of RHIBE is impressive, the size of a private key and an update key in previous RHIBE schemes still depends on the size of a private key and a ciphertext in the tree-based revocation scheme. Recently, Park, Lee, and Lee [22] proposed a new RIBE scheme with short keys from multilinear maps by using the public-key broadcast encryption (PKBE) scheme of Boneh, Gentry, and Waters [6] for the key revocation. Their new technique enables for RIBE to have a constant number of private key elements and update key elements. Therefore, we ask the following question in this paper: *"Can we also reduce the size of keys further in RHIBE by using the PKBE scheme for the key revocation?"*

1.1 Our Results

In this paper, we propose two RHIBE schemes from multilinear maps[1] with shorter private key elements and shorter update key elements. The followings are our results:

RHIBE via History-Preserving Updates. We first construct an RHIBE scheme via history-preserving updates from three-leveled multilinear maps by combining the HIBE scheme of Boneh and Boyen (BB-HIBE) [3] and the PKBE scheme of Boneh, Gentry and Waters (BGW-PKBE) [6]. We also prove its security in the selective revocation model under the multilinear Diffie-Hellman exponent (MDHE) assumption. In this RHIBE scheme, the number of group elements in a private key, an update key, and a ciphertext is $O(\ell)$, $O(\ell)$, and $O(\ell)$ respectively where ℓ is the maximum number of hierarchy identity. Note that the number of private key elements and update key elements in our RHIBE scheme only depends on the depth of a hierarchy identity.

RHIBE via History-Free Updates. Next, we present another RHIBE scheme via history-free updates from three-leveled multilinear maps with a constant number of private key elements. This RHIBE scheme is

[1] Note that many candidate multilinear maps are currently broken [9, 10], but the multilinear map from indistinguishability obfuscation is still alive [1].

Table 1: Comparison of revocable hierarchical identity-based encryption schemes

Scheme	PP Size	SK Size	UK Size	Model	Maps	Assumption
SE [25]	$O(\ell)$	$O(\ell^2 \log N)$	$O(\ell r \log \frac{N}{r})$	SE-IND	BLM	DBDH
SE (CS) [27]	$O(\ell)$	$O(\ell \log N)$	$O(\ell r \log \frac{N}{r})$	SE-IND	BLM	q-Type
SE (SD) [27]	$O(\ell)$	$O(\ell \log^2 N)$	$O(\ell r)$	SRL-IND	BLM	q-Type
LP (CS) [18]	$O(1)$	$O(\log N)$	$O(\ell + r \log \frac{N}{r})$	SE-IND	BLM	q-Type
LP (SD) [18]	$O(1)$	$O(\log^2 N)$	$O(\ell + r)$	SRL-IND	BLM	q-Type
Ours	$O(N + \lambda \ell)$	$O(\ell)$	$O(\ell)$	SRL-IND	MLM	MDHE
Ours	$O(N + \lambda \ell)$	$O(1)$	$O(\ell)$	SRL-IND	MLM	MDHE

Let λ be a security parameter, ℓ be the maximum hierarchical level, N be the maximum number of users, and r be the number of revoked users. Sizes for public parameters (PP), private keys (SK), and update keys (UK) count group elements. BLM stands for bilinear maps and MLM stands for multilinear maps.

also secure in the selective revocation list model under the MDHE assumption. In this RHIBE scheme, the number of group elements in a private key, an update key, and a ciphertext is $O(1)$, $O(\ell)$, and $O(\ell)$ respectively. Compared with our first RHIBE scheme that has $O(\ell)$ group elements in a private key, our second RHIBE scheme just has $O(1)$ group elements in a private key. The detailed comparison of RHIBE schemes is given in Table 1.

1.2 Our Techniques

To construct RHIBE schemes with shorter keys from multilinear maps, we basically follow the design technique of Park, Lee, and Lee [22] that uses the BGW-PKBE scheme [6] instead of the tree-based revocation system of Naor et al. [21]. However, the naive employment of this technique does not work since the delegation of private keys should be considered. To solve this problem, we devise new techniques for RHIBE in multilinear maps. We briefly review the RIBE scheme of Park, Lee, and Lee [22] and then overview our two-level RHIBE scheme for a simple exposition.

If we simply follow the design strategy of Park et al. [22], a trusted center which has a master key $\beta_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon$ creates a private key for a 1-level identity $ID_1 = (I_1)$ as $SK_{ID_1} = \big(g_1^{\alpha^{d_1}\gamma_\varepsilon} F_{1,1}(I_1)^{-r_{1,1}}, g_1^{-r_{1,1}}\big)$ and broadcasts a 0-level update key for time T and a revoked set R_ε as $UK_{T,R_\varepsilon} = \big(g_1^{\beta_\varepsilon}, (g_1^{\gamma_\varepsilon} \prod_{j \in SI_\varepsilon} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}})^{\beta_\varepsilon} H_1(T)^{r_2}, g_1^{-r_2}\big)$ where d_i is an index assigned to ID_1 and SI_ε is the set of receiver indexes. Note that SK_{ID_1} is tied to the private key of PKBE and UK_{T,R_ε} is tied to the ciphertext header of PKBE. After that, the 1-level user of the identity ID_1 can delegate his private key to a 2-level user with an identity $ID_2 = (I_1, I_2)$ by creating a 2-level private key as $SK_{ID_2} = \big(\{g_1^{\alpha^{d_1}\gamma_\varepsilon} F_{1,1}(I_1)^{-r_{1,1}}, g_1^{-r_{1,1}}\},\ \{g_1^{\alpha^{d_2}\gamma_{ID_1}} F_{1,2}(I_2)^{-r_{1,2}}, g_1^{-r_{1,2}}\}\big)$. Next, the 1-level user broadcasts a 1-level update key for time T and a revoked set R_{ID_1} as $UK_{T,R_{ID_1}} = \big(\{(g_1^{\gamma_\varepsilon} \prod_{j \in SI_\varepsilon} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}})^{\beta_\varepsilon} H_1(T)^{r_{2,1}}, g_1^{-r_{2,1}}\}$, $\{(g_1^{\gamma_{ID_1}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_1}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}})^{\beta_{ID_1}} H_1(T)^{r_{2,2}}, g_1^{-r_{2,2}}\}\big)$. If $(I_1) \notin R_\varepsilon$ and $(I_1, I_2) \notin R_{ID_1}$, then the 2-level user of the identity $ID_2 = (I_1, I_2)$ can derive a decryption key $DK_{ID_2,T} = \big(g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}(\beta_\varepsilon + \beta_{ID_1})} \prod_{i=1}^{2} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_{1,i}} H_1(T)^{r_2}, g_2^{r_{1,1}}, g_2^{r_{1,2}}$, $g_2^{r_2}\big)$ by performing paring operations.

However, there are some problems in the above approach. The first problem is that the 2-level user can extract the private key of the 1-level user from his private key since SK_{ID_1} is contained in SK_{ID_2}. The second

problem is that the master key part $g_1^{\alpha^{N+1}(\beta_\varepsilon+\beta_{ID_1})}$ of the decryption key $DK_{ID_2,T}$ is wrongly structured since a random value β_{ID_1} that is hidden to a sender is used. To overcome these problems, we devise a new *random blinding technique* for RHIBE that safely blinds a private key in delegation and cancels unnecessary random values in decryption. In this technique, the private key component $g_1^{\alpha^d\gamma_\varepsilon}F_{1,1}(I_1)^{-r_{1,1}}$ of SK_{ID_1} is multiplied by a random element $g_1^{-r_{0,2}}$ and a new element $g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_1}}g_2^{\beta_\varepsilon r_{0,2}}$ is included in the private key delegation process. This newly added element enables to cancel the random values $r_{0,2}$ and β_{ID_1} in the decryption key derivation process. Note that a 2-level user who is not revoked in R_{ID_1} only can derive a correct decryption key which has a master key $g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon}$ by cancelling the random values. Furthermore, if we encode the identity of a user carefully, we can reduce the size of private key elements from $O(\ell^2)$ to $O(\ell)$ where ℓ is the hierarchical depth of the identity. Therefore, we can build an RHIBE scheme via the history-preserving updates [25] in which a private key and an update key include all private keys and update keys of lower level users from 3-leveled multilinear maps.

To achieve an RHIBE scheme with a constant number of private key elements, we apply the history-free updates approach of Seo and Emura [27]. Let SK_{ID_1} be the 1-level private key for ID_1, UK_{T,R_ε} be the 0-level update key, and $DK_{ID_1,T}$ be the 1-level decryption key as the same as our first RHIBE scheme. By following this approach, the 1-level user with an identity $ID_1=(I_1)$ simply creates a 2-level private key for $ID_2=(I_1,I_2)$ as $SK_{ID_2}=(g_1^{\alpha^{d_2}\gamma_{ID_1}}F_{1,2}(I_2)^{-r_{1,2}},g_1^{-r_{1,2}})$. Next, he creates a 1-level update key $UK_{T,R_{ID_1}}$ by using his decryption key $DK_{ID_1,T}$ instead of using the 0-level update key UK_{T,R_ε}. In this step, we use the random blinding technique to prevent a collusion attack. That is, the decryption key component $g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon}F_{2,1}(I_1)^{-r_{1,1}}H_2(T)^{r_0}$ is safely blinded by a random element $g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_1}}$. Then, the 1-level update key is formed as $UK_{T,R_{ID_1}}=\big(\{g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon}g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_1}}F_{1,1}(I_1)^{-r_{1,1}}H_2(T)^{r_0},g_2^{r_1},g_2^{r_0}\},\ \{g_1^{\beta_{ID_1}},(g_1^{\gamma_{ID_1}}\prod_{j\in SI_{ID_1}}g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}})^{\beta_{ID_1}}H_1(T)^{r_2},g_1^{-r_2}\}\big)$. Note that this random blinding element is removed in the decryption key derivation process. Therefore, we have an RHIBE scheme with shorter private keys.

1.3 Related Work

The concept of IBE was introduced by Shamir to solve the certificate management problem in PKE [28]. After the first realization of an IBE scheme in bilinear maps by Boneh and Franklin [5], many IBE schemes in bilinear maps were proposed [3, 12, 29, 30]. As mentioned before, providing an efficient revocation mechanism for IBE is a very important issue. Boneh and Franklin introduced a simple revocation method for IBE by concatenating an identity *ID* with time *T* [5]. However, this method is not scalable since a trusted center periodically generates a private key for each user on each time period. The first scalable RIBE scheme was proposed by Boldyreva, Goyal, and Kumar [2] by combining the Fuzzy IBE scheme of Sahai and Waters [24] and the complete subtree (CS) scheme of Naor et al. [21]. Many other RIBE schemes also followed this design technique [20, 26]. A different RIBE scheme that uses the subset difference (SD) scheme instead of using the CS scheme proposed by Lee et al. [16]. Recently, Park, Lee, and Lee proposed a new RIBE scheme from multilinear maps that has a constant number of private key elements and update key elements [22].

As mentioned before, the notion of IBE can be extended to HIBE where a trusted center can delegate the generation of private keys to other users. After the introduction of HIBE [15], many HIBE scheme with different properties were proposed [3, 4, 8, 13, 14, 17, 19, 30]. The first RHIBE scheme was presented by Seo and Emura [25] that combines the BB-HIBE scheme and the CS scheme. To reduce the size of private keys in the first RHIBE scheme, Seo and Emura proposed another RHIBE scheme via history-free update method that combines the BBG-HIBE scheme and the CS (or SD) scheme [27]. In previous RHIBE

schemes, the maximum hierarchy depth should be fixed in the setup phase. To overcome this limitation, Ryu et al. proposed an unbounded RHIBE scheme by using an unbounded HIBE scheme [23]. Recently, Lee and Park proposed an RHIBE scheme with shorter private keys and update keys [18]. To reduce the size of private keys and update keys, they first presented a new HIBE scheme that supports a short intermediate private key and build an RHIBE scheme in a modular way.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we review multilinear maps and complexity assumptions in multilinear maps.

2.1 Notation

Let λ be a security parameter and $[n]$ be the set $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the identity space. A hierarchical identity ID with a depth k is defined as an identity vector $ID = (I_1,\ldots,I_k) \in \mathcal{I}^k$. We let $ID|_j$ be a vector $(I_1,\ldots,I_j)$ of size j derived from ID. If $ID = (I_1,\ldots,I_k)$, then we have $ID = ID|_k$. We define $ID|_0 = \varepsilon$ for simplicity. A function $\mathbf{Prefix}(ID|_k)$ returns a set of prefix vectors $\{ID|_j\}$ where $1 \le j \le k$ where $ID|_k = (I_1,\ldots,I_k) \in \mathcal{I}^k$ for some k. For two hierarchical identities $ID|_i$ and $ID|_j$ with $i < j$, $ID|_i$ is an ancestor identity of $ID|_j$ and $ID|_j$ is a descendant identity of $ID|_i$ if $ID|_i \in \mathbf{Prefix}(ID|_j)$.

2.2 Leveled Multilinear Maps

We define generic leveled multilinear maps that are the leveled version of the cryptographic multilinear maps introduced by Boneh and Silverberg [7]. We follow the definition of Garg, Gentry, and Halevi [11].

Definition 2.1 (Leveled Multilinear Maps)**.** We assume the existence of a group generator G, which takes as input a security parameter λ and a positive integer k. Let $\vec{\mathbb{G}} = (\mathbb{G}_1,\ldots,\mathbb{G}_k)$ be a sequence of groups of large prime order $p > 2^\lambda$. In addition, we let g_i be a canonical generator of $\mathbb{G}_i$ respectively. We assume the existence of a set of bilinear maps $\{e_{i,j} : \mathbb{G}_i \times \mathbb{G}_j \to \mathbb{G}_{i+j} | i,j \ge 1; i+j \le k\}$ that have the following properties:

- Bilinearity: The map $e_{i,j}$ satisfies the following relation: $e_{i,j}(g_i^a, g_j^b) = g_{i+j}^{ab} : \forall a,b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$
- Non-degeneracy: We have that $e_{i,j}(g_i, g_j) = g_{i+j}$ for each valid i, j.

We say that $\vec{\mathbb{G}}$ is a multilinear group if the group operations in $\vec{\mathbb{G}}$ as well as all bilinear maps are efficiently computable. We often omit the subscripts of $e_{i,j}$ and just write e.

2.3 Complexity Assumptions

We introduce complexity assumptions in multilinear maps. This assumption is the multilinear version of the Bilinear Diffie-Hellman Exponent (BDHE) assumption of Boneh, Gentry, and Waters [6].

Assumption 1 (Multilinear Diffie-Hellman Exponent, (k,N)-MDHE)**.** Let $(p, \vec{\mathbb{G}}, \{e_{i,j} | i,j \ge 1; i+j \le k\})$ be the description of a k-leveled multilinear group of order p. Let g_i be a generator of $\mathbb{G}_i$. The decisional (k,N)-MDHE assumption is that if the challenge tuple

$$D = \left(g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^{c_1}, \ldots, g_1^{c_{k-1}}\right) \text{ and } Z$$

are given, no PPT algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ can distinguish $Z = Z_0 = g_k^{a^{N+1}\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} c_i}$ from a random element $Z = Z_1 \in \mathbb{G}_k$ with more than a negligible advantage. The advantage of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as $\mathbf{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(k,N)\text{-}MDHE}(1^\lambda) = \left|\Pr[\mathcal{A}(D, Z_0) = 0] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}(D, Z_1) = 0]\right|$ where the probability is taken over random choices of $a, c_1, \ldots, c_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

Assumption 2 (Three-Leveled Multilinear Diffie-Hellman Exponent, $(3,N)$-MDHE)**.** Let $(p, \vec{\mathbb{G}}, e_{1,1}, e_{1,2}, e_{2,1})$ be the description of a three-leveled multilinear group of order p. Let g_i be a generator of $\mathbb{G}_i$. The decisional $(3,N)$-MDHE assumption is that if the challenge tuple

$$D = \left(g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^b, g_1^c\right) \text{ and } Z$$

are given, no PPT algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ can distinguish $Z = Z_0 = g_3^{a^{N+1}bc}$ from a random element $Z = Z_1 \in \mathbb{G}_3$ with more than a negligible advantage. The advantage of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as $\mathbf{Adv}_{\mathcal{A}}^{(3,N)\text{-}MDHE}(1^\lambda) = \left|\Pr[\mathcal{A}(D, Z_0) = 0] - \Pr[\mathcal{A}(D, Z_1) = 0]\right|$ where the probability is taken over random choices of $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

3 Revocable HIBE with History-Preserving Updates

In this section, we first define the syntax and the security of RHIBE. Next, we propose an RHIBE scheme with history-preserving updates from three-leveled multilinear maps and prove its selective security.

3.1 Definition

Revocable HIBE (RHIBE) is an extension of IBE that provides both the delegation of private keys and the revocation of private keys [25]. In RHIBE, a user who has a private key SK_{ID} for a hierarchical identity $ID = (I_1, \ldots, I_{\ell-1})$ can generate a (long-term) private key $SK_{ID'}$ for a child user with the identity $ID' = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$ where $ID \in \mathbf{Prefix}(ID')$. The user with ID also periodically broadcasts an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID}}$ for the set R_{ID} of revoked child users at a time period T. If the child user with ID' who has a private key $SK_{ID'}$ is not included in the revoked set R_{ID}, then he can derive a (short-term) decryption key $DK_{ID',T}$ from $SK_{ID'}$ and $UK_{T,R_{ID'}}$. A sender creates a ciphertext $CT_{ID',T}$ that encrypts a message M for a receiver identity ID' and a time period T, and then the receiver who has a decryption key $DK_{ID',T}$ can obtain the message by decrypting the ciphertext $CT_{ID',T}$. The syntax of RHIBE is defined as follows:

Definition 3.1 (Revocable HIBE)**.** A revocable HIBE (RHIBE) scheme that is associated with the identity space $\mathcal{I}$, the time space $\mathcal{T}$, and the message space $\mathcal{M}$, consists of seven algorithms **Setup**, **GenKey**, **UpdateKey**, **DeriveKey**, **Encrypt**, **Decrypt**, and **Revoke**, which are defined as follows:

Setup$(1^\lambda, N, L)$: The setup algorithm takes as input a security parameter 1^λ, the maximum number N of users in each depth, and the maximum depth L of the identity. It outputs a master key MK, a revocation list RL_ε, a state ST_ε, and public parameters PP.

GenKey$(ID|_\ell, SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$: The private key generation algorithm takes as input a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) \in \mathcal{I}^\ell$, a private key $SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, the state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, and public parameters PP. It outputs a private key $SK_{ID|_\ell}$ for $ID|_\ell$ and updates $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

UpdateKey$(T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$: The update key generation algorithm takes as input update time $T \in \mathcal{T}$, a revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}$, the state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$ for T and $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ where $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ is the set of revoked identities at the time T.

DeriveKey($SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP$): The decryption key derivation algorithm takes as input a private key $SK_{ID|_\ell}$, an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs a decryption key $DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$ or $\perp$.

Encrypt($ID|_\ell, T, M, PP$): The encryption algorithm takes as input a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) \in \mathcal{I}$, time T, a message $M \in \mathcal{M}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs a ciphertext $CT_{ID|_\ell,T}$ for $ID|_\ell$ and T.

Decrypt($CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP$): The decryption algorithm takes as input a ciphertext $CT_{ID|_\ell,T}$, a decryption key $DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs an encrypted message M or $\perp$.

Revoke($ID|_\ell, T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$): The revocation algorithm takes as input a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell$ and revocation time T, a revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, and a state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. It updates the revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

The correctness property of RHIBE is defined as follows: For all PP generated by **Setup**$(1^\lambda, N, L)$, $SK_{ID|_\ell}$ generated by **GenKey**$(ID|_\ell, SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$ for any $ID|_\ell$, $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$ generated by **UpdateKey**$(T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$ for any T and $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, $CT_{ID|_\ell,T}$ generated by **Encrypt**$(ID|_\ell, T, M, PP)$ for any $ID|_\ell$, T, and M, it is required that

- If $(ID|_\ell \notin R_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$, then **DeriveKey**$(SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP) = DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$.
- If $(ID|_\ell \in R_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$, then **DeriveKey**$(SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP) = \perp$ with all but negligible probability.
- If $(ID|_\ell = ID'|_\ell) \wedge (T = T')$, then **Decrypt**$(CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP) = M$.
- If $(ID|_\ell \neq ID'|_\ell) \vee (T \neq T')$, then **Decrypt**$(CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP) = \perp$ with all but negligible probability.

The security model of RHIBE with history-preserving updates was defined by Seo and Emura [25]. For the security proof our RHIBE scheme, we define a selective revocation list model where an adversary initially submits the set of revoked identities. This weaker model was introduced by Boldyreva, et al. [2] and used in other schemes [16, 22, 27]. In this paper, we follow the selective revocation list model refined by Seo and Emura [27]. In this security model of RHIBE, an adversary initially submits a challenge identity $ID^*|_{\ell^*}$, challenge time T^*, and a revoked identity set R^* at the time T^*. After receiving public parameters PP, the adversary can adaptively request private keys, update keys, decryption keys, and revocations with some restrictions. In the challenge step, the adversary submits challenge messages M_0^*, M_1^* and the challenger creates a challenge ciphertext CT^* that encrypts one of the challenge messages. The adversary continually requests private keys, update keys, and decryption keys. Finally, if the adversary correctly guesses the encrypted message, then he wins the game. The details of the security model is described as follows:

Definition 3.2 (Selective Revocation List Security, SRL-IND)**.** The SRL-IND security of RHIBE is defined in terms of the following experiment between a challenger $\mathcal{C}$ and a PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}$:

1. **Init**: $\mathcal{A}$ initially submits a challenge identity $ID^*|_{\ell^*} \in \mathcal{I}^{\ell^*}$, challenge time $T^* \in \mathcal{T}$, and a revoked identity set $R^* \subseteq \mathcal{I}^\ell$ at the time T^*.
2. **Setup**: $\mathcal{C}$ generates a master key MK, a revocation list RL_ε, a state ST_ε, and public parameters PP by running **Setup**$(1^\lambda, N, L)$. It keeps $MK, RL_\varepsilon, ST_\varepsilon$ to itself and gives PP to $\mathcal{A}$.

3. **Phase 1**: $\mathcal{A}$ adaptively requests a polynomial number of queries. These queries are processed as follows:

   - **Private key**: If this is a private key query for a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell$, then it gives the private key $SK_{ID|_\ell}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ by running **GenKey**$(ID|_\ell, SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$ with the restriction: If $ID|_\ell$ is a prefix of $ID^*|_{\ell^*}$ where $\ell \leq \ell^*$, then the revocation query for $ID|_\ell$ or one of its ancestors must be queried at some time T where $T \leq T^*$.
   - **Update key**: If this is an update key query for a hierarchical identity $ID|_{\ell-1}$ and time T, then it gives the update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ by running **UpdateKey**$(T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$ with the restriction: If $T = T^*$, then the revoked identity set of $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ at the time T^* should be equal to a revoked identity set derived from R^*.
   - **Decryption key**: If this is a decryption key query for a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell$ and time T, then it gives the decryption key $DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$ to $\mathcal{A}$ by running **DeriveKey**$(SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP)$ with the restriction: The decryption key query for $ID^*|_{\ell^*}$ and T^* cannot be queried.
   - **Revocation**: If this is a revocation query for a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell$ and revocation time T, then it updates the revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ by running **Revoke**$(ID|_\ell, T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ with the restriction: The revocation query for time T cannot be queried if the update key query for the time T was already requested.

   Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is allowed to request the update key query and the revocation query in non-decreasing order of time, and an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$ implicitly includes a revoked identity set $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ derived from $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

4. **Challenge**: $\mathcal{A}$ submits two challenge messages $M_0^*, M_1^* \in \mathcal{M}$ with equal length. $\mathcal{C}$ flips a random coin $b \in \{0,1\}$ and gives the challenge ciphertext CT^* to $\mathcal{A}$ by running **Encrypt**$(ID^*|_{\ell^*}, T^*, M_b^*, PP)$.

5. **Phase 2**: $\mathcal{A}$ may continue to request a polynomial number of private keys, update keys, and decryption keys subject to the same restrictions as before.

6. **Guess**: Finally, $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a guess $b' \in \{0,1\}$, and wins the game if $b = b'$.

The advantage of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as $\mathbf{Adv}^{SRL\text{-}IND}_{RHIBE,\mathcal{A}}(1^\lambda) = \left|\Pr[b = b'] - \frac{1}{2}\right|$ where the probability is taken over all the randomness of the experiment. An RHIBE scheme is SRL-IND secure if for all PPT adversary $\mathcal{A}$, the advantage of $\mathcal{A}$ in the above experiment is negligible in the security parameter λ.

3.2 Building Blocks

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{0,1\}^{l_1}$ be the identity space and $\mathcal{T} = \{0,1\}^{l_2}$ be the time space where $l_1 = 2\lambda$ and $l_2 = \lambda$ for a security parameter λ. Let $ID = (I_1, \ldots, I_k)$ be an hierarchical identity. We define **EncodeCID**(ID) as a function that takes as input $ID = (I_1, \ldots, I_k)$ and outputs a concatenated identity $CID = (CI_1, \ldots, CI_k)$ where $CI_j = H(I_1 \| \cdots \| I_j)$, $\|$ denotes the concatenation of two strings, and H is a collision-resistant hash function. This encoding function has an interesting property such that if $ID \notin$ **Prefix**(ID') then $CI_k \neq CI'_i$ for all $i \in [k]$ except with negligible probability [18].

We describe a modified HIBE scheme of Boneh and Boyen [3] that additionally takes a time period in multilinear groups. Note that we define the key-encapsulation mechanism (KEM) version of HIBE.

HIBE.Setup(GDS_{MLM}, L**):** Let $GDS_{MLM} = (p, \vec{\mathbb{G}} = (\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2, \mathbb{G}_3), \{e_{i,j}\}, g_1, g_2, g_3)$ be the description of a multilinear group and L be the maximum depth of the hierarchical identity.

1. It first selects random elements $\{f_{1,i,0}\}_{1\le i\le L}, \{f_{1,i,j,b}\}_{1\le i\le L, 1\le j\le l_1, b\in\{0,1\}} \in \mathbb{G}_1$. It also selects random $h_{1,0}, \{h_{1,j,b}\}_{1\le j\le l_2, b\in\{0,1\}} \in \mathbb{G}_1$. Let $\vec{f}_{k,i} = \left(f_{k,i,0}, \{f_{k,i,j,b}\}\right)$ and $\vec{h}_k = \left(h_{k,0}, \{h_{k,j,b}\}\right)$ for a multi-linear level k. Note that $\{\vec{f}_{2,i}\}_{1\le i\le L}$ and $\vec{h}_2$ can be obtained from $\{\vec{f}_{1,i}\}_{1\le i\le L}$ and $\vec{h}_1$ by performing pairing operations.
2. Next, it defines $F_{k,i}(CI) = f_{k,i,0}\prod_{j=1}^{l_1} f_{k,i,j,CI[j]}$ and $H_k(T) = h_{k,0}\prod_{j=1}^{l_2} h_{k,i,j,T[j]}$ where $CI[j]$ is a bit value at the position j and $T[j]$ is a bit value at the position j.
3. It selects a random exponent $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and outputs a master key $MK = \alpha$ and public parameters

$$PP = \left(GDS_{MLM},\ \{\vec{f}_{1,i}\}_{1\le i\le L},\ \vec{h}_1,\ \Lambda = g_3^{\alpha}\right).$$

HIBE.GenKey($ID|_\ell, T, MK, PP$): Let $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) \in \mathcal{I}^\ell$, $T \in \mathcal{T}$, and $MK = \alpha$. It obtains $CID|_\ell = (CI_1, \ldots, CI_\ell)$ by calling **EncodeCID**$(ID|_\ell)$. It selects random exponents $r_1, \ldots, r_\ell, r_{L+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and outputs a private key

$$SK_{ID|_\ell,T} = \left(D_0 = g_2^{\alpha}\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} F_{2,i}(CI_i)^{r_i}\cdot H_2(T)^{r_{L+1}},\ \left\{D_i = g_2^{-r_i}\right\}_{i=1}^{\ell},\ D_{L+1} = g_2^{-r_{L+1}}\right) \in \mathbb{G}_2^{\ell+2}.$$

HIBE.RandKey($SK_{ID|_\ell,T}, PP$): Let $SK_{ID|_\ell,T} = (D'_0, \ldots, D'_\ell, D'_{L+1})$ and $ID = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$. It selects random exponents $r_1, \ldots, r_\ell, r_{L+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and outputs a randomized private key $SK_{ID|_\ell,T} = \big(D_0 = D'_0 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} F_{2,i}(CI_1)^{r_i} \cdot H_2(T)^{r_{L+1}},\ \left\{D_i = D'_i \cdot g_2^{-r_i}\right\}_{i=1}^{\ell},\ D_{L+1} = D'_{L+1}\cdot g_2^{-r_{L+1}}\big)$.

HIBE.Delegate($ID|_\ell, SK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T}, PP$): Let $SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}} = (D'_0, \ldots, D'_\ell)$ and $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$. It obtains $CID|_\ell = (CI_1, \ldots, CI_\ell)$ by calling **EncodeCID**$(ID|_\ell)$. It selects random a exponent $r_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a temporal private key $TSK_{ID|_\ell,T} = \big(D_0 = D'_0 \cdot F_{2,\ell}(CI_\ell)^{r_\ell},\ \left\{D_i = D'_i\right\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1},\ D_\ell = g_2^{-r_\ell},\ D_{L+1} = D'_{L+1}\big)$. Next, it outputs a delegated private key $SK_{ID|_\ell,T}$ by running **HIBE.RandKey**$(TSK_{ID|_\ell,T}, PP)$.

HIBE.Encrypt($ID|_\ell, T, s, PP$): Let $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$ and s is a random exponent in $\mathbb{Z}_p$. It obtains $CID|_\ell = (CI_1, \ldots, CI_\ell)$ by calling **EncodeCID**$(ID|_\ell)$. It outputs a ciphertext header

$$CH_{ID|_\ell,T} = \left(C_0 = g_1^{s},\ \left\{C_i = F_{1,i}(CI_i)^{s}\right\}_{i=1}^{\ell},\ C_{L+1} = H_1(T)^{s}\right) \in \mathbb{G}_1^{\ell+2}$$

and a session key $EK = \Lambda^s$.

HIBE.Decrypt($CH_{ID|_\ell,T}, SK_{ID'|_{\ell'},T'}, PP$): Let $CH_{ID|_\ell,T} = (C_0, \{C_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell}, C_{L+1})$ and $SK_{ID'|_{\ell'},T'} = (D_0, \{D_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell}, D_{L+1})$. If $(ID|_\ell = ID'|_{\ell'}) \wedge (T = T')$, then it outputs the session key EK by computing $e_{1,2}(C_0, D_0)\cdot\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} e_{1,2}(C_i, D_i)\cdot e_{1,2}(C_{L+1}, D_{L+1})$. Otherwise, it outputs $\perp$.

Let $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ where N is the (polynomial) number of users. We describe the PKBE scheme of Boneh, Gentry, and Waters [6].

PKBE.Setup(GDS_{BLM}, N): Let $GDS_{BLM} = ((p, \vec{\mathbb{G}} = (\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2), e_{1,1}), g_1, g_2)$ and N be the maximum number of users. It selects random exponents $\alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and outputs a master key $MK = (\alpha, \gamma)$, an element $Y = g_1^{\gamma}$, and public parameters

$$PP = \left(GDS_{BLM},\ \left\{X_j = g_1^{\alpha^j}\right\}_{1\le j, j\ne N+1\le 2N},\ \Gamma = g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}}\right).$$

PKBE.GenKey(d, MK, PP): Let $d \in \mathcal{N}$ be an index and $MK = (\alpha, \gamma)$. It outputs a private key $SK_d = \left(K = g_1^{\alpha^d \gamma}\right)$.

PKBE.Encrypt(S, β, Y, PP): Let S be a set of receiver indexes, β be a random exponent in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, and $Y = g_1^{\gamma}$ be a group element in $\mathbb{G}_1$. It outputs a ciphertext header

$$CH_S = \left(E_0 = g_1^{\beta},\ E_1 = \left(Y \prod_{j \in S} X_{N+1-j}\right)^{\beta}\right)$$

and a session key $EK = \Gamma^{\beta}$.

PKBE.Decrypt(CH_S, SK_d, PP): Let $CH_S = (E_0, E_1)$ and $SK_d = K$. If $d \in S$, then it outputs the session key EK by computing $e(X_d, E_1) \cdot e(E_0, K \cdot \prod_{j \in S, j \neq d} X_{N+1-j+d})^{-1}$. Otherwise, it outputs $\perp$.

Theorem 3.1 ([6]). *The BGW-PKBE scheme is selectively secure under chosen plaintext attacks if the N-BDHE assumption holds.*

3.3 Construction

By using the HIBE and PKBE schemes that are described in the previous section, we can build an RHIBE scheme. Our RHIBE scheme with history-preserving updates in multilinear maps is described as follows:

RHIBE.Setup($1^{\lambda}, N, L$): Let N be the maximum number users in each depth and L be the maximum depth of the hierarchical identity.

1. It first generates a multilinear group $\vec{\mathbb{G}} = (\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2, \mathbb{G}_3)$ of prime order p. Let $GDS_{MLM} = (p, \vec{\mathbb{G}}, \{e_{1,1}, e_{1,2}, e_{2,1}\}, g_1, g_2, g_3)$ be the description of the multilinear group where g_1, g_2, g_3 are generators of $\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2, \mathbb{G}_3$ respectively.
2. It obtains MK_{HIBE}, PP_{HIBE} by running **HIBE.Setup**(GDS_{MLM}, L). It also obtains $MK_{BE} = (\alpha, \gamma), PP_{BE}$ by running **PKBE.Setup**(GDS_{MLM}, N).
3. It selects a random exponent $\beta_{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and saves $(\beta_{\varepsilon}, \gamma_{\varepsilon})$ to ST_{ε} where $\beta_{\varepsilon} = \beta_{ID_0}$ and $\gamma_{\varepsilon} = \gamma_{ID_0} = \gamma$. It outputs a master key $MK = \alpha$, an empty revocation list RL_{ε}, a state ST_{ε}, and public parameters

$$PP = \left(GDS_{MLM},\ PP_{HIBE},\ PP_{BE},\ g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}},\ g_2^{\beta_{\varepsilon}},\ \Omega = g_3^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{\varepsilon}}\right).$$

RHIBE.GenKey($ID|_{\ell}, SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP$): Let $ID|_{\ell} = (I_1, \ldots, I_{\ell}) \in \mathcal{I}^{\ell}$ and $SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}} = \left(\{d_i, LSK'_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1}\right)$ where $LSK'_i = (K'_{i,0}, K'_{i,1}, R'_{i,0}, R'_{i,1})$ and $\ell \geq 1$. It obtains $CID|_{\ell} = (CI_1, \ldots, CI_{\ell})$ by calling **EncodeCID**$(ID|_{\ell})$. Recall that $SK_{ID|_0}$ is empty.

1. If a tuple $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ exist in $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then it retrieves $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ from $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. Otherwise, it selects random exponents $\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and saves $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ to $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.
2. If $\ell \geq 2$, then it selects a random exponent $r_{\ell-1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates an updated level private key

$$LSK_{\ell-1} = \Big(K_{\ell-1,0} = K'_{\ell-1,0} \cdot g_1^{-r_{\ell-1,2}},\ K_{\ell-1,1} = K'_{\ell-1,1},$$
$$R_{\ell-1,0} = g_2^{\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}},\ R_{\ell-1,1} = \left(g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}}\right)^{\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}} \cdot \left(g_2^{\beta_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}\right)^{r_{\ell-1,2}}\Big)$$

where $g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}}$ can be retrieved from PP and $g_2^{\beta_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}$ can be retrieved from $LSK_{\ell-2}$ or PP.

3. It assigns a unique index $d_\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ to the identity $ID|_\ell$ and adds a tuple $(ID|_\ell, d_\ell)$ to $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. It obtains $SK_{BE,d_\ell} = K_{BE} = g_1^{\alpha^{d_\ell}\gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$ by running **PKBE.GenKey**$(d_\ell, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP_{BE})$. Next, it selects a random exponent $r_{\ell,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level private key

$$LSK_\ell = \Big(K_{\ell,0} = K_{BE} \cdot F_{1,\ell}(CI_\ell)^{-r_{\ell,1}},\ K_{\ell,1} = g_1^{-r_{\ell,1}},\ R_{\ell,0} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2},\ R_{\ell,1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2}\Big) \in \mathbb{G}_1^2 \times \mathbb{G}_2^2.$$

4. Finally, it outputs a private key $SK_{ID|_\ell} = \big(\{d_i, LSK_i = LSK_i'\}_{i=1}^{\ell-2}, \{d_i, LSK_i\}_{i=\ell-1}^{\ell}\big)$.

RHIBE.UpdateKey($T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-2}}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP$**):** Let $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-2}}} = \big(\{SI_{ID|_i}, LUK_i'\}_{i=0}^{\ell-2}\big)$ where $LUK_i = (U_{i,0}, U_{i,1}, U_{i,2})$ and $\ell \geq 1$. Recall that $UK_{T,ID|_{-1}}$ is empty.

1. It defines a revoked set $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ of user identities at time T from $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. From $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, it defines a revoked index set $RI_{ID|_{\ell-1}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ by using $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ since $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ contains $(ID|_\ell, d_\ell)$. After that, it defines a non-revoked index set $SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}} = \mathcal{N} \setminus RI_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.
2. It retrieves $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ from $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. It obtains $CH_{BE} = (E_0, E_1)$ by running **PKBE.Encrypt** $(SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, Y_{ID|_{\ell-1}} = g_1^{\gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP_{BE})$. It selects a random exponent $r_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level update key

$$LUK_{\ell-1} = \Big(U_{\ell-1,0} = E_0,\ U_{\ell-1,1} = E_1 \cdot H_1(T)^{r_{\ell-1}},\ U_{\ell-1,2} = g_1^{-r_{\ell-1}}\Big) \in \mathbb{G}_1^3.$$

3. Finally, it outputs an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}} = \big(\{SI_{ID|_i},\ LUK_i = LUK_i'\}_{i=0}^{\ell-2}, \{SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}},\ LUK_{\ell-1}\}\big)$.

RHIBE.DeriveKey($SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP$**):** Let $SK_{ID|_\ell} = (\{d_i, LSK_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell})$ where $LSK_i = (K_{i,0}, K_{i,1}, R_{i,0}, R_{i,1})$ and $\ell \geq 1$, and $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}} = (\{SI_{ID|_i}, LUK_i\}_{i=0}^{\ell-1})$ where $LUK_i = (U_{i,0}, U_{i,1}, U_{i,2})$. If $ID|_\ell \in R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then it outputs $\perp$ since the identity $ID|_\ell$ is revoked. Otherwise, it proceeds as follows:

1. For each $i \in [\ell]$, it retrieves $\{d_i, LSK_i = (K_{i,0}, K_{i,1}, R_{i,0}, R_{i,1})\}$ and $\{SI_{ID|_{i-1}}, LUK_{i-1} = (U_{i-1,0}, U_{i-1,1}, U_{i-1,2})\}$ and computes the following components

$$A_{i,0} = e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i-1,1}) \cdot e_{1,1}\big(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,0} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID|_{i-1}}, j \neq d_i} X_{N+1-j+d_i}\big)^{-1},$$

$$A_{i,1} = e_{1,1}(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,1}),\ A_{i,2} = e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i-1,2}).$$

2. Next, it derives a temporal decryption key

$$TDK_{ID|_\ell,T} = \Big(D_0 = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A_{i,0} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} R_{i,1}^{-1},\ \{D_i = A_{i,1}\}_{i=1}^{\ell},\ D_{L+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A_{i,2}\Big) \in \mathbb{G}_2^{\ell+2}.$$

3. Finally, it outputs a decryption key $DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$ by running **HIBE.RandKey**$(TDK_{ID|_\ell,T}, PP_{HIBE})$.

RHIBE.Encrypt($ID|_\ell, T, M, PP$**):** Let $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$. It first chooses a random exponent $s \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and obtains CH_{HIBE} by running **HIBE.Encrypt**$(ID|_\ell, T, s, PP_{HIBE})$. It outputs a ciphertext $CT_{ID|_\ell,T} = \big(C = \Omega^s \cdot M,\ CH_{HIBE}\big)$.

RHIBE.Decrypt($CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP$**):** Let $CT_{ID|_\ell,T} = (C, CH_{HIBE})$. If $(ID|_\ell = ID'|_\ell) \wedge (T = T')$, then it obtains EK_{HIBE} by running **HIBE.Decrypt**$(CH_{HIBE}, DK_{ID',T'}, PP_{HIBE})$ and outputs the message M by computing $M = C \cdot EK_{HIBE}^{-1}$. Otherwise, it outputs $\perp$.

RHIBE.Revoke($ID|_\ell, T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$**):** If $(ID|_\ell, -) \notin ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then it outputs $\perp$ since the private key of $ID|_\ell$ was not generated. Otherwise, it updates $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ by adding $(ID|_\ell, T)$ to $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

3.4 Correctness

Let $SK_{ID|_\ell} = (\{d_i, LSK_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell})$ be a private key for $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$ where $LSK_i = (K_{i,0}, K_{i,1}, R_{i,0}, R_{i,1})$ and d_i is an index for $ID|_i = (I_1, \ldots, I_i)$. Let $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}} = (\{SI_{ID|_i}, LUK_i\}_{i=0}^{\ell-1})$ be an update key for time T and a revoked set $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. If $ID|_\ell \notin R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then we obtain the following equations

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{i,0} &= e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i-1,1}) \cdot e_{1,1}\Big(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,0} \cdot \prod_{j \in SI_{ID|_{i-1}}, j \neq d_i} X_{N+1-j+d_i}\Big)^{-1} \\
&= EK_{BE} \cdot e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, H_1(T)^{r_i}) \cdot e_{1,1}(E_0, F_{1,i}(CI_i)^{r_{i,1}} g_1^{r_{i,2}}) \\
&= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1} \beta_{ID|_{i-1}}} H_2(T)^{\alpha^{d_i} r_i} F_{2,i}(CI_i)^{\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,1}} g_2^{\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,2}}, \\
A_{i,1} &= e_{1,1}(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,1}) = e_{1,1}\big(g_1^{\beta_{ID|_{i-1}}}, g_1^{-r_{i,1}}\big) = g_2^{-\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,1}}, \\
A_{i,2} &= e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i-1,2}) = e_{1,1}\big(g_1^{\alpha^{d_i}}, g_1^{-r_i}\big) = g_2^{-\alpha^{d_i} r_i}
\end{aligned}$$

from the correctness of the PKBE scheme. The decryption key derivation algorithm correctly derives a temporal decryption key as

$$\begin{aligned}
D_0 &= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A_{i,0} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} R_{i,1}^{-1} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} g_2^{\alpha^{N+1} \beta_{ID|_{i-1}}} H_2(T)^{\alpha^{d_i} r_i} F_{2,i}(CI_i)^{\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,1}} g_2^{\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,2}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1} \beta_{ID|_i}} g_2^{-\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,2}} \\
&= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1} \beta_\varepsilon} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} F_{2,i}(CI_i)^{\beta_{ID|_{i-1}} r_{i,1}} \cdot H_2(T)^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha^{d_i} r_i}, \\
D_{L+1} &= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A_{i,2} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} g_2^{-\alpha^{d_i} r_i} = g_2^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha^{d_i} r_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the temporal decryption key is the same as the private key of the above HIBE scheme.

3.5 Security Analysis

We first prove the security of the modified HIBE scheme. Note that the selective KEM security model of the modified HIBE scheme can be easily derived from the original selective KEM security model of HIBE by simply incorporating a time period T in private keys and the challenge ciphertext. We omit the description of the security model.

Theorem 3.2. *The above modified HIBE scheme is selectively secure under chosen plaintext attacks if the* $(3, N)$*-MDHE assumption holds.*

Proof. Suppose there exists an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ that attacks the above HIBE scheme with a non-negligible advantage. A simulator $\mathcal{B}$ that solves the MDHE assumption using $\mathcal{A}$ is given: a challenge tuple $D = \big(g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^b, g_1^c\big)$ and Z where $Z = Z_0 = g_3^{a^{N+1} bc}$ or $Z = Z_1 \in \mathbb{G}_3$. Then $\mathcal{B}$ that interacts with $\mathcal{A}$ is described as follows:

Init: $\mathcal{A}$ initially submits a challenge identity $ID^*|_{\ell^*} = (I_1^*, \ldots, I_{\ell^*}^*)$ and challenge time T^*. It obtains $CID^*|_{\ell^*} = (CI_1^*, \ldots, CI_{\ell^*}^*)$ by calling **EncodeCID**$(ID^*|_{\ell^*})$.

Setup: $\mathcal{B}$ first chooses random exponents $\{f'_{i,0}\}_{1\le i\le L}, \{f'_{i,j,k}\}_{1\le i\le L, 1\le j\le l_1, k\in\{0,1\}}, h'_0, \{h'_{j,k}\}_{1\le j\le l_2, k\in\{0,1\}}, \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. It implicitly sets $\alpha = a^{N+1}b$ and publishes the public parameters PP as

$$\vec{f}_{1,i} = \Big(f_{1,i,0} = g_1^{f'_{i,0}} \big(\prod_{j=1}^{l_1} f_{1,i,j,CI^*[j]}\big)^{-1},\ \big\{ f_{1,i,j,k} = \big(g_1^{a^N}\big)^{f'_{i,j,k}} \big\}_{1\le i\le L, 1\le j\le l_1, k\in\{0,1\}} \Big),$$

$$\vec{h}_1 = \Big(h_{1,0} = g_1^{h'_0} \big(\prod_{j=1}^{l_2} h_{1,j,T^*[j]}\big)^{-1},\ \big\{ h_{1,j,k} = \big(g_1^{b}\big)^{h'_{j,k}} \big\}_{1\le j\le l_2, k\in\{0,1\}} \Big),$$

$$\Lambda = e\big(e(g_1^{\alpha}, g_1^{\alpha^N}), g_1^{b}\big) = g_3^{\alpha^{N+1}b}.$$

For notational simplicity, we define $\Delta CI_i = \sum_{j=1}^{l_1} (f'_{i,j,CI[j]} - f'_{i,j,CI^*[j]})$ and $\Delta T = \sum_{j=1}^{l_2} (h'_{j,T[j]} - h'_{j,T^*[j]})$. We have $\Delta CI_i \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ except with negligible probability if $CI_i \neq CI_i^*$ since there exists at least one index j such that $f'_{i,j,CI[j]} \neq f'_{i,j,CI^*[j]}$ and $\{f'_{i,j,k}\}$ are randomly chosen. We also have $\Delta T \not\equiv 0 \mod p$ except with negligible probability if $T \neq T^*$.

Phase 1: $\mathcal{A}$ adaptively requests a polynomial number of private key queries. If this is a private key query for a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$ and a time period T, then $\mathcal{B}$ obtains $CID|_\ell = (CI_1, \ldots, CI_\ell)$ by calling **EncodeCID**$(ID|_\ell)$ and proceeds as follows.

- **Case** $ID_\ell \notin$ **Prefix**$(ID^*|_{\ell^*})$: In this case, we have $CI_\ell \neq CI_i^*$ for all i by the property of the encoding function [18]. It selects random exponents $r_1, \ldots, r_{\ell-1}, r'_\ell, r_{L+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a private key $SK_{ID_\ell,T}$ by implicitly setting $r_\ell = (-a/\Delta CI_\ell + r'_\ell)b$ as

$$D_0 = e\big((g_1^a)^{-f'_{\ell,0}/\Delta CI_\ell} F_1(CI_\ell)^{r'_\ell}, g_1^b\big) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(CI_i)^{r_i} \cdot H_2(T)^{r_{L+1}},$$

$$\big\{D_i = g_2^{r_i}\big\}_{1\le i\le \ell-1},\ D_\ell = e\big((g_1^a)^{-1/\Delta CI_\ell} g_1^{r'_\ell}, g_1^b\big),\ D_{L+1} = g_2^{r_{L+1}}.$$

- **Case** $ID|_\ell = ID^*|_{\ell^*}$: In this case, we have $T \neq T^*$. It selects random exponents $r_1, \ldots, r_\ell, r'_{L+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a private key $SK_{ID_\ell,T}$ by implicitly setting $r_{L+1} = (-a/\Delta T + r'_{L+1})a^N$ as

$$D_0 = e\big((g_1^a)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_{L+1}}, g_1^{a^N}\big) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} F_{2,i}(CI_i)^{r_i},$$

$$\{D_i = g_2^{r_i}\}_{1\le i\le \ell},\ D_{L+1} = e\big((g_1^a)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_{L+1}}, g_1^{a^N}\big).$$

Challenge: $\mathcal{B}$ creates the challenge ciphertext header CH^* by implicitly setting $s = c$ as

$$C_0 = g_1^c,\ \big\{C_i = (g_1^c)^{f'_{i,0}}\big\}_{1\le i\le \ell^*},\ C_{L+1} = (g_1^c)^{h'_0}$$

and the challenge session key $EK^* = Z$.

Phase 2: Same as Phase 1.

Guess: Finally, $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a guess $\mu' \in \{0,1\}$. $\mathcal{B}$ also outputs μ'. □

Theorem 3.3. *The above RHIBE scheme is SRL-IND secure if the* $(3,N)$*-MDHE assumption holds where* N *is the maximum number of child users in the system.*

Proof. Suppose there exists an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ that attacks the above RHIBE scheme with a non-negligible advantage. A meta-simulator $\mathcal{B}$ that solves the MDHE assumption using $\mathcal{A}$ is given: a challenge tuple $D = \big((p,\mathbb{G}_1,\mathbb{G}_2,\mathbb{G}_3), g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^b, g_1^c\big)$ and Z where $Z = Z_0 = g_3^{a^{N+1}bc}$ or $Z = Z_1 \in \mathbb{G}_3$. Note that a challenge tuple $D_{BDHE} = \big((p,\mathbb{G}_1,\mathbb{G}_2), g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^b\big)$ for the BDHE assumption can be derived from the challenge tuple D of the MDHE assumption. Let $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ be the simulator in the security proof of Theorem 3.2 and $\mathcal{B}_{PKBE}$ be a simulator in security proof of Theorem 3.1. Then $\mathcal{B}$ that interacts with $\mathcal{A}$ is described as follows:

Init: $\mathcal{A}$ initially submits a challenge identity $ID^*|_{\ell^*} = (I_1^*, \ldots, I_{\ell^*}^*)$, a challenge time period T^*, and a revoked identity set $R^* = (R^*_{ID_0}, \ldots, R^*_{ID_{L-1}})$ at the time period T^*. It first sets a state ST and a revocation list RL as empty one. For each $ID_k \in \{ID^*\} \cup R^*$, it selects a unique index $d_i \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $(-, d_i) \notin ST_{ID_{k-1}}$ and adds (ID_k, d_i) to $ST_{ID_{k-1}}$. Let $RI^* = (RI^*_{ID_0}, \ldots, RI^*_{ID_{\ell^*-1}}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ be the revoked index set of R^* at the time T^* and $SI^* = (SI^*_{ID_1}, \ldots, SI^*_{ID_{\ell^*-1}})$ be the non-revoked index set at the time T^* such that $SI^*_{ID_x} = \mathcal{N} \setminus RI^*_{ID_x}$.

Setup: $\mathcal{B}$ submits $ID^*_{\ell^*}$ and T^* to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ and receives PP_{HIBE}. It also submits SI^*_ε to $\mathcal{B}_{PKBE}$ and receives PP_{PKBE}. Note that $\{ID_i^* \notin R_{ID^*_{i-1}}\}_{1\le i<x}$ and $\{ID_i^* \in R_{ID^*_{i-1}}\}_{x\le i\le \ell^*}$. $\mathcal{B}$ first chooses random exponents $\theta_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \theta_{ID^*_{\ell^*-1}}, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{x-1}}, \beta_{ID^*_x}, \ldots, \beta_{ID^*_{\ell^*}} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. It implicitly sets $\alpha = a, \beta_\varepsilon = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID_0}, \{\beta_{ID_i} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID_i}\}_{1\le i<x}, \{\gamma_{ID^*_x} = \theta_{ID^*_x} - \sum_{j\in SI_{ID^*_x}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{0\le x\le \ell^*-1}$ and publishes the public parameters PP as

$$PP = \Big(PP_{HIBE},\ PP_{PKBE},\ g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}} = e(g_1^a, g_2^{a^N}),\ g_2^{\beta_\varepsilon} = g_2^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}} = e(g_1, g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}}),$$
$$\Omega = g_3^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon} = g_3^{a^{N+1}(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_0})} = e\big(e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N}), g_1^b\big) \cdot e\big(e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N}), g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}}\big)\Big).$$

Phase 1: $\mathcal{A}$ adaptively requests a polynomial number of private key, update key, and decryption key queries. If this is a private key query for an identity $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$, then $\mathcal{B}$ proceeds as follows: Note that $SK_{ID|_\ell} = \big(\{d_i, LSK_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell}\big)$ where $LSK_i = (K_{i,0}, K_{i,1}, R_{i,0}, R_{i,1})$.

- **Case** $ID|_{\ell-1} \notin$ **Prefix**$(ID^*|_{\ell^*})$: It first normally generates a state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ and adds a tuple $(ID|_\ell, d_\ell)$ to $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ where d_ℓ is an index for $ID|_\ell$. It obtains $SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ by requesting an RHIBE private key query for $ID|_{\ell-1}$ to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$. Next, it simply generates $SK_{ID|_\ell}$ by running **RHIBE.GenKey**$(ID|_\ell, SK_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$.
- **Case** $ID|_{\ell-1} \in$ **Prefix**$(ID^*|_{\ell^*})$: Note that $ID_0 = ID_{\ell-1}$ is included in this case. We have $ID_\ell = (I_1^*, \ldots, I^*_{\ell-1}, I_\ell)$, $\{ID_i^* \notin R_{ID^*_{i-1}}\}_{1\le i<x}$ and $\{ID_i^* \in R_{ID^*_{i-1}}\}_{x\le i\le \ell-1}$.
  - **Case** $ID|_\ell \in R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$: In this case, it first retrieves a tuple (ID_ℓ, d_ℓ) from $ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ where the index d_ℓ is associated with ID_ℓ. Note that the tuple (ID_ℓ, d_ℓ) exists since all identities in $R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ were added to $ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ in the initialization step.

    If $1 \le i < x$, the simulator can use the cancellation technique by using the random blind element. It recalls random exponents $\theta_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \theta_{ID^*_{x-2}}, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{x-1}}$ and selects random exponents $r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_{x-1,1}, \hat{r}_{1,2}, \ldots, \hat{r}_{x-1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates level private keys by implicitly setting $\{r_{i,2} = \hat{r}_{i,2} - a^{N+1}\}_{1\le i<x}$ as

$$\Big\{LSK_i = \Big(K_{i,0} = \big(g_1^{a^{d_i}}\big)^{\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}, j\neq d_i} g_1^{a^{N+1-j+d_i}}\Big)^{-1} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}},\ K_{i,1} = g_1^{-r_{i,1}},$$
$$R_{i,0} = e(g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1),\ R_{i,1} = (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \cdot e(g_1^b, g_1^{\hat{r}_{i,2}}) \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_{i,2}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \cdot (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}\Big)\Big\}_{1\le i<x}.$$

If $i = x$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh et al. [6]. It recalls random exponents $\gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}}, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}, \beta_{ID^*_i}$ and obtains $SK_{BE} = K_{BE}$ by requesting an PKBE private key query for $(d_i, \gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}})$. Next, it selects random exponents $r_{i,1}, r_{i,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level private key as

$$LSK_i = \Big(K_{i,0} = K_{BE} \cdot F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-r_{i,2}},\ K_{i,1} = g_1^{-r_{i,1}},$$
$$R_{i,0} = e(g_1^{\beta_{ID^*_i}}, g_1),\ R_{i,1} = e(g_1^{a^N}, g_1^a)^{\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot e(g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1^{r_{i,2}})\Big).$$

If $x < i \leq \ell - 1$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh et al. [6]. It recalls random exponents $\gamma_{ID^*_x}, \ldots, \gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-2}}, \beta_{ID^*_x}, \ldots, \beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and obtains $\{SK_{BE,i} = K_{BE,i}\}_{x<i\leq\ell-1}$ by requesting an PKBE private key query for $\{(d_i, \gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}})\}_{x<i\leq\ell-1}$. Next, it selects random exponents $r_{x+1,1}, \ldots, r_{\ell-1,1}, r_{x+1,2}, \ldots, r_{\ell-1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates level private keys as

$$\{LSK_i = \Big(K_{i,0} = K_{BE} \cdot F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-r_{i,2}},\ K_{i,1} = g_1^{-r_{i,1}},$$
$$R_{i,0} = e(g_1^{\beta_{ID_i}}, g_1),\ R_{i,1} = e(g_1^{a^N}, g_1^a)^{\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot e(g_1^{\beta_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1^{r_{i,2}})\Big)\}_{x<i\leq\ell-1}.$$

If $i = \ell$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh et al. [6]. It recalls a random exponent $\gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}}$ and obtains $SK_{BE} = K_{BE}$ by requesting an PKBE private key query for $(d_i, \gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}})$. Next, it selects a random exponent $r_{i,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level private key as

$$LSK_i = \Big(K_{i,0} = K_{BE} \cdot F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-r_{i,2}},\ K_{i,1} = g_1^{-r_{i,1}},$$
$$R_{i,0} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2},\ R_{i,1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2}\Big).$$

– **Case** $ID_\ell \notin R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$: In this case, we have $\{ID_i \notin R_{ID_{i-1}}\}_{1\leq i\leq\ell}$ and $\ell < x$, since, if a parents identity is revoked $ID_i \in R_{ID_{i-1}}$, then a child identity should be revoked $ID_{i+1} \in R_{ID_i}$. It first selects an index $d_\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $(-, d_\ell) \notin ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and adds (ID_ℓ, d_ℓ) to $ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$.
If $1 \leq i < \ell - 1$, the simulator can use the cancellation technique by using the random blind element. It recalls random exponents $\theta_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \theta_{ID^*_{\ell-2}}, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and selects random exponents $r_{1,1}, \ldots, r_{\ell-1,1}, \hat{r}_{1,2}, \ldots, \hat{r}_{\ell-1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates level private keys by implicitly setting $\{r_{i,2} = \hat{r}_{i,2} - a^{N+1}, \gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{i-1}} - \sum_{j\in SI_{ID^*_{i-1}}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{1\leq i<\ell}$ as

$$\Big\{LSK_i = \Big(K_{i,0} = \big(g_1^{a^{d_i}}\big)^{\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}, j\neq d_i} g_1^{a^{N+1-j+d_i}}\Big)^{-1} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}},\ K_{i,1} = g_1^{-r_{i,1}},$$
$$R_{i,0} = e(g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1),\ R_{i,1} = (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \cdot e(g_1^b, g_1^{\hat{r}_{i,2}}) \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_{i,2}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \cdot (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}\Big)\Big\}_{1\leq i<\ell}.$$

If $i = \ell$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh and Boyen [3]. We have $I_i \neq I^*_i$ from the restriction of Definition 3.2. It selects a random exponent $r'_{i,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level private key by implicitly setting $r_{i,1} = -a/\Delta I_i + r'_{i,1}$ as

$$LSK_i = \Big(K_{i,0} = g_1^{a^d \theta_{ID_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} (g_1^a)^{f'_0/\Delta I_i} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r'_{i,1}},\ K_{i,1} = (g_1^a)^{-1/\Delta I_i} g_1^{r'_{i,1}},$$
$$R_{i,0} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2},\ R_{i,1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2}\Big).$$

If this is an update key query for an identity $ID|_{\ell-1} = (I_1, \ldots, I_{\ell-1})$ and a time period T, then $\mathcal{B}$ defines a revoked identity set $R_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ at the time T from $RL_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ and proceeds as follows: Note that $UK_{T,R_{ID_{\ell-1}}} = \left(\{SI_{ID_i}, LUK_i\}_{i=0}^{\ell-1}\right)$ where $LUK_i = (U_{i,0}, U_{i,1}, U_{i,2})$. We assume that $(I_1 = I_1^*), \ldots, (I_y = I_y^*), (I_{y+1} \neq I_{y+1}^*), \ldots, (I_{\ell-1} \neq I_{\ell-1}^*)$ where $1 \leq y \leq \ell - 1$. And, we have $\{ID_i^* \notin R_{ID_{i-1}^*}\}_{1 \leq i < x}$ and $\{ID_i^* \in R_{ID_{i-1}^*}\}_{x \leq i \leq \ell-1}$.

- **Case** $T \neq T^*$: It first sets a revoked index set $RI_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ of $R_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ by using $ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}$. It also sets $SI_{ID_{\ell-1}} = \mathcal{N}_\ell \setminus RI_{ID_{\ell-1}}$.

  If $0 \leq i \leq x$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh and Boyen [3]. It recalls a random exponent $\hat{\beta}_{ID_0^*}, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_{ID_x^*}, \theta_{ID_0^*}, \ldots, \theta_{ID_x^*}$ and selects a random exponent $r'_0, \ldots, r'_x \in Z_p$. It creates level update keys by implicitly setting $\{r_i = -(-\sum_{j \in SI_{ID_i^*}^* \setminus SI_{ID_i}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j \in SI_{ID_i} \setminus SI_{ID_i^*}^*} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq x}$ as

$$\Big\{ LUK_i = \Big(U_{i,0} = g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}},$$
$$U_{i,1} = (g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}})^{\theta_{ID_i^*}} \Big(\prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i^*}^* \setminus SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i} \setminus SI_{ID_i^*}^*} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \Big)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_i},$$
$$U_{i,2} = \Big(\prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i^*}^* \setminus SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i} \setminus SI_{ID_i^*}^*} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \Big)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_i} \Big) \Big\}_{0 \leq i \leq x}.$$

  If $x < i \leq y$, it recalls a random exponent $\beta_{ID_{x+1}^*}, \ldots, \beta_{ID_y^*}, \theta_{ID_{x+1}^*}, \ldots, \theta_{ID_y^*}$ and selects a random exponent $r_{x+1}, \ldots, r_y \in Z_p$. It creates a level update key as

$$\Big\{ LUK_i = \Big(U_{i,0} = g_1^{\beta_{ID_i^*}},$$
$$U_{i,1} = \Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID_i}} \big(\prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i}^*} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \big)^{-1} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \Big)^{\beta_{ID_i^*}} H_1(T)^{r_i}$$
$$U_{i,2} = g_1^{r_i} \Big) \Big\}_{x < i \leq y}.$$

  If $y < i \leq \ell - 1$, the simulator can normally generate level private keys. It selects random exponents $r_{y+1}, \ldots, r_{\ell-1}, \gamma_{ID_{y+1}}, \ldots, \gamma_{ID_{\ell-1}}, \beta_{ID_{y+1}}, \ldots, \beta_{ID_{\ell-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates level private keys as

$$\Big\{ LUK_i = \Big(U_{i,0} = g_1^{\beta_{ID_i}},\ U_{i,1} = (g_1^{\gamma_{ID_i}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}})^{\beta_{ID_i}} H_1(T)^{r_i},\ U_{i,2} = g_1^{-r_i} \Big) \Big\}_{y < i \leq \ell-1}.$$

- **Case** $T = T^*$: We have $R = R^*$. For each $ID_i \in R_{ID_{i-1}^*}^*$, it adds (ID_i, T^*) to $RL_{ID_{i-1}^*}$ if $(ID_i, T') \notin RL_{ID_{i-1}^*}$ for any $T' \leq T^*$.

  If $0 \leq i \leq x$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh et al. [6]. It recalls random exponents $\hat{\beta}_{ID_0^*}, \ldots, \hat{\beta}_{ID_x^*}, \theta_{ID_0^*}, \ldots, \theta_{ID_x^*}$ and selects a random exponent $r_0, \ldots, r_x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. It creates level update keys as

$$\Big\{ LUK_i = \Big(U_{i,0} = g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}},\ U_{i,1} = (g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}})^{\theta_{ID_i^*}} H_1(T^*)^{r_{i,0}},\ U_{i,2} = g_1^{-r_{i,0}} \Big) \Big\}_{0 \leq i \leq x}.$$

If $x < i \leq y$, the simulator can use the partitioning technique of Boneh et al. [6]. It recalls random exponents $\beta_{ID^*_{x+1}}, \ldots, \beta_{ID^*_y}, \theta_{ID^*_{x+1}}, \ldots, \theta_{ID^*_y}$ and selects a random exponent $r_{x+1}, \ldots, r_y \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. It creates level update keys as

$$\left\{ LUK_i = \left(U_{i,0} = g_1^{\beta_{ID^*_i}},\ U_{i,1} = (g_1^{\beta_{ID^*_i}})^{\theta_{ID^*_i}} H_1(T^*)^{r_{i,0}},\ U_{i,2} = g_1^{-r_{i,0}} \right) \right\}_{x<i\leq y}.$$

If $y < i \leq \ell - 1$, the simulator can normally generate level private keys. It selects random exponents $r_{y+1}, \ldots, r_{\ell-1}, \gamma_{ID_{y+1}}, \ldots, \gamma_{ID_{\ell-1}}, \beta_{ID_{y+1}}, \ldots, \beta_{ID_{\ell-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates level private keys as

$$\left\{ LUK_i = \left(U_{i,0} = g_1^{\beta_{ID_i}},\ U_{i,1} = (g_1^{\gamma_{ID_i}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}})^{\beta_{ID_i}} H_1(T)^{r_i},\ U_{i,2} = g_1^{-r_i} \right) \right\}_{y<i\leq \ell-1}.$$

If this is a decryption key query for an identity $ID = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$ and a time period T, then $\mathcal{B}$ proceeds as follows: It requests an HIBE private key for ID and T to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ and receives $SK_{HIBE,ID,T}$. Next, it sets the decryption key $DK_{ID,T} = SK_{HIBE,ID,T}$.

Challenge: $\mathcal{A}$ submits two challenge messages M_0^*, M_1^*. $\mathcal{B}$ chooses a random bit $\delta \in \{0,1\}$ and proceed as follows: It requests the challenge ciphertext for ID^* and T^* to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ and receives CH_{HIBE,ID^*,T^*}. Next, it sets the challenge ciphertext $CT_{ID^*,T^*} = \left(C = Z \cdot e(e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N}), g_1^c)^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}} \cdot M_\delta^*,\ CH_{HIBE,ID^*,T^*} \right)$.

Phase 2: Same as Phase 1.

Guess: Finally, $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a guess $\delta' \in \{0,1\}$. $\mathcal{B}$ outputs 0 if $\delta = \delta'$ or 1 otherwise.

To finish the proof, we first show that the distribution of the simulation is correct from Lemma 3.4. This completes our proof. □

Lemma 3.4. *The distribution of the above simulation is correct if $Z = Z_0$, and the challenge ciphertext is independent of δ in the adversary's view if $Z = Z_1$.*

Proof. We show that the distribution of private keys is correct. In case of $ID_\ell \in R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and $ID_{\ell-1} \in$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$, we have that the private key is correctly distributed from the setting $\{r_{i,2} = \hat{r}_{i,2} - a^{N+1}\}_{1\leq i<x}$, $\{\beta_{ID^*_i} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}\}_{0\leq i<x}$, and $\{\gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{i-1}} - \sum_{j\in SI_{ID^*_{i-1}}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{1\leq i<x}$ as the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\{K_{i,0} &= g_1^{\alpha^{d_i} \gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-r_{i,2}} = g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}} g^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}+a^{N+1}} \\
&= g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} \cdot g_1^{-a^{N+1}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}} \cdot g_1^{a^{N+1}} \\
&= \left(g_1^{a^{d_i}}\right)^{\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \left(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j+d_i}} \right)^{-1} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}}, \\
R_{i,0} &= g_2^{\beta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} = g_2^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} = e(g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1), \\
R_{i,1} &= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot g_2^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,2}} = g_2^{a^{N+1}(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i})} \cdot g_2^{(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}})(\hat{r}_{i,2}-a^{N+1})} \\
&= g_2^{a^{N+1}b + a^{N+1}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_{i,2}b - a^{N+1}b + \hat{r}_{i,2}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}} - a^{N+1}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \\
&= (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \cdot e(g_1^b, g_1^{\hat{r}_{i,2}}) \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_{i,2}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \cdot (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \}_{1\leq i<x}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\{R_{i,1} = g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot g_2^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,2}} = e(g_1^{\alpha^N}, g_1^{\alpha})^{\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot e(g_1^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}}}, g_1^{r_{i,2}}) = e(g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a})^{\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot e(g_1^{b} \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1^{r_{i,2}})\}_{i=x}.$$

In case of $ID_\ell \notin R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and $ID_{\ell-1} \in \textbf{Prefix}(ID^*_{\ell^*})$, we have that the private key is correctly distributed from the setting $\{r_{i,2} = \hat{r}_{i,2} - a^{N+1}\}_{1\le i<\ell}$, $\{\beta_{ID^*_i} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}\}_{0\le i<\ell}$, $r_{\ell,1} = -a/\Delta I_\ell + r'_{\ell,1}$, and $\{\gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{i-1}} - \sum_{j\in SI_{ID^*_{i-1}}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{0\le i<\ell}$ as the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\{K_{i,0} &= g_1^{\alpha^{d_i}\gamma_{ID^*_{i-1}}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-r_{i,2}} = g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}} g^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}+a^{N+1}} \\
&= g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} \cdot g_1^{-a^{N+1}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} \cdot g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}} \cdot g_1^{a^{N+1}} \\
&= \big(g_1^{a^{d_i}}\big)^{\theta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j+d_i}}\big)^{-1} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} g_1^{-\hat{r}_{i,2}}, \\
R_{i,0} &= g_2^{\beta_{ID^*_{i-1}}} = g_2^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} = e(g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}, g_1), \\
R_{i,1} &= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot g_2^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,2}} = g_2^{a^{N+1}(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i})} \cdot g_2^{(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}})(\hat{r}_{i,2}-a^{N+1})} \\
&= g_2^{a^{N+1}b + a^{N+1}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_{i,2}b - a^{N+1}b + \hat{r}_{i,2}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}} - a^{N+1}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \\
&= (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \cdot e(g_1^b, g_1^{\hat{r}_{i,2}}) \cdot g_2^{\hat{r}_{i,2}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}} \cdot (g_2^{a^{N+1}})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{i-1}}}\}_{1\le i<\ell}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\{K_{i,0} &= g_1^{\alpha^{d_{ID_{i-1}}}\gamma_{ID_{x-1}}} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r_{i,1}} = g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}} g^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} \big(f_{1,0}\prod_{j=1}^{l} f_{1,i,I_i[j]}\big)^{-r_{i,1}} \\
&= g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} \cdot g_1^{-a^{N+1}} \big(g_1^{f'_0} g_1^{a^N \Delta I_i}\big)^{a/\Delta I_1 - r'_{i-1,1}} \\
&= g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID_{i-1}}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{i-1}}\setminus\{d_i\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} (g_1^a)^{f'_0/\Delta I_i} F_{1,i}(I_i)^{-r'_{i,1}}, \\
K_{i,1} &= g_1^{r_{i,1}} = (g_1^a)^{-1/\Delta I_i} g_1^{r'_{i,1}}\}_{i=\ell}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that the distribution of update keys is correct. In case of $T \neq T^*$, we have that the update key is correctly distributed from the setting $\{r_i = -(-\sum_{j\in SI^*_{ID^*_i}\setminus SI_{ID_i}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j\in SI_{ID_i}\setminus SI^*_{ID^*_i}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_i\}_{0\le i\le x}$, $\{\beta_{ID^*_i} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}\}_{0\le i\le x}$, and $\{\gamma_{ID^*_i} = \theta_{ID^*_i} - \sum_{j\in SI_{ID^*_i}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{1\le i\le y}$ as the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
\{U_{i,0} &= g_1^{\beta_{ID^*_i}} = g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}}, \\
U_{i,1} &= \big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID_i}} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}}} H_1(T)^{r_{i+1,0}} \\
&= \Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID_i}} \big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\big)^{-1} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_i}} \big(h_{1,0}\prod_{k=1}^{t} h_{1,k,T[k]}\big)^{r_{i+1,0}}
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&=(g_1^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}})^{\theta_{ID_i}}\Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}\setminus SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}\setminus SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}}\\
&\quad\cdot\big(g_1^{h'_0}g_1^{b\Delta T}\big)^{-(-\sum_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}\setminus SI_{ID_i}} a^{N+1-j}+\sum_{j\in SI_{ID_i}\setminus SI^*_{ID_i}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T+r'_{i+1,0}}\\
&=(g_1^b\cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}})^{\theta_{ID_i^*}}\Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i^*}\setminus SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}\setminus SI^*_{ID_i^*}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_{i,0}},\\
U_{i,2}=&g_1^{r_{i,0}}=\Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i^*}\setminus SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}\setminus SI^*_{ID_i^*}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_{i,0}}\}_{0\le i\le x}.
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\{U_{i,1}=\big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID_i^*}}\prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID_i^*}}H_1(T)^{r_i}=\Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID_i}}\big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\big)^{-1}\prod_{j\in SI_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{\beta_{ID_i^*}}H_1(T)^{r_i}\}_{x<i\le y}.
$$

In case of $T=T^*$, we have that the update key is correctly distributed from the setting $\{\beta_{ID_i^*}=b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_i^*}\}_{0\le i<x}$ and $\{\gamma_{ID_i}=\theta_{ID_i}-\sum_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{0\le i\le y}$ as the following equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\{U_{i,1}&=\big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID_i}}\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID_i^*}}\cdot H_1(T^*)^{r_i}=\Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID_i}}\big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\big)^{-1}\cdot\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_i}}\cdot H_1(T^*)^{r_i}\\
&=(g_1^b\cdot g_1^{\beta ID_i})^{\theta_{ID_i}}H_1(T^*)^{r_{i,0}}\ \}_{1\le i\le x-1},\\
\{U_{i,1}&=\big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID_i}}\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID_i^*}}\cdot H_1(T^*)^{r_i}=\Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID_i}}\big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\big)^{-1}\cdot\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_i}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{\beta_{ID_i^*}}\cdot H_1(T^*)^{r_i}\\
&=(g_1^{\beta_{ID_i^*}})^{\theta_{ID_i}}H_1(T^*)^{r_i}\}_{x<i\le y}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, we show that the distribution of the challenge ciphertext is correct. If $Z=Z_0=g_3^{a^{N+1}bc}$ is given, then the challenge ciphertext is correctly distributed as the following equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
C=\Omega^s\cdot M^*_\delta&=\big(e(e(g_1^a,g_1^{a^N}),g_1^b)\cdot e(e(g_1^a,g_1^{a^N}),g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}})\big)^c\cdot M^*_\delta\\
&=e(e(g_1^a,g_1^{a^N}),g_1^b)^c\cdot e(e(g_1^a,g_1^{a^N}),g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}})^c\cdot M^*_\delta\\
&=Z_0\cdot e(e(g_1^a,g_1^{a^N}),g_1^c)^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_0}}\cdot M^*_\delta
\end{aligned}
$$

Otherwise, the component C of the challenge ciphertext is independent of δ in the $\mathcal{A}$'s view since Z_1 is a random element in $\mathbb{G}_3$. This completes our proof. □

4 Revocable HIBE with History-Free Updates

In this section, we first define the syntax and the security model of RHIBE with history-free updates. Next, we propose another RHIBE scheme with short private key and prove its security.

4.1 Definition

Definition 4.1 (Revocable HIBE: History-Free Update)**.** A revocable HIBE (RHIBE) scheme that is associated with the identity space $\mathcal{I}$, the time space $\mathcal{T}$, and the message space $\mathcal{M}$, consists of seven algorithms **Setup**, **GenKey**, **UpdateKey**, **DeriveKey**, **Encrypt**, **Decrypt**, and **Revoke**, which are defined as follows:

Setup$(1^\lambda, N, L)$: The setup algorithm takes as input a security parameter 1^λ, the maximum number N of users in each depth, and the maximum depth L of the identity. It outputs a master key MK, a revocation list RL_ε, a state ST_ε, and public parameters PP.

GenKey$(ID|_\ell, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$: The private key generation algorithm takes as input a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) \in \mathcal{I}^\ell$, a state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, and public parameters PP. It outputs a private key $SK_{ID|_\ell}$ and updates the state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

UpdateKey$(T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, DK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$: The update key generation algorithm takes as input update time $T \in \mathcal{T}$, a revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, a decryption key $DK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T}$, a state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs an update key $UK_{T,R|_{ID_{\ell-1}}}$ for T and $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ where $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ is the set of revoked identities at the time T.

DeriveKey$(SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP)$: The decryption key derivation algorithm takes as input a private key $SK_{ID|_\ell}$, an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs a decryption key $DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$ or $\perp$.

Encrypt$(ID|_\ell, T, M, PP)$: The encryption algorithm takes as input a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) \in \mathcal{I}$, time T, a message $M \in \mathcal{M}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs a ciphertext $CT_{ID|_\ell,T}$ for $ID|_\ell$ and T.

Decrypt$(CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP)$: The decryption algorithm takes as input a ciphertext $CT_{ID|_\ell,T}$, a decryption key $DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}$, and the public parameters PP. It outputs an encrypted message M or $\perp$.

Revoke$(ID|_\ell, T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$: The revocation algorithm takes as input a hierarchical identity $ID|_\ell$ and revocation time T, a revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, and a state $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. It updates the revocation list $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

The correctness property of RHIBE is defined as follows: For all MK, PP generated by **Setup**$(1^\lambda, N, L)$, SK_{ID_ℓ} generated by **GenKey**$(ID|_\ell, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$ for any $ID|_\ell$, $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}$ generated by **UpdateKey** $(T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, DK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP)$ for any T and $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, $CT_{ID|_\ell,T}$ generated by **Encrypt**$(ID|_\ell, T, M, PP)$ for any $ID|_\ell$, T, and M, it is required that

- If $(ID|_\ell \notin R_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$, then **DeriveKey**$(SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP) = DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$.
- If $(ID|_\ell \in R_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$, then **DeriveKey**$(SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP) = \perp$ with all but negligible probability.
- If $(ID|_\ell = ID'|_\ell) \wedge (T = T')$, then **Decrypt**$(CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP) = M$.
- If $(ID|_\ell \neq ID'|_\ell) \vee (T \neq T')$, then **Decrypt**$(CT_{ID|_\ell,T}, DK_{ID'|_\ell,T'}, PP) = \perp$ with all but negligible probability.

4.2 Construction

Our RHIBE scheme from three-leveled multilinear maps is described as follows:

RHIBE.Setup($1^\lambda, N, L$): Let N be the maximum number users in each depth and L be the maximum depth of the hierarchical identity.

1. It first generates a multilinear group $\vec{\mathbb{G}} = (\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2, \mathbb{G}_3)$ of prime order p. Let $GDS_{MLM} = (p, \vec{\mathbb{G}}, \{e_{1,1}, e_{1,2}, e_{2,1}\}, g_1, g_2, g_3)$ be the description of the multilinear group where g_1, g_2, g_3 are generators of $\mathbb{G}_1, \mathbb{G}_2, \mathbb{G}_3$ respectively.
2. It obtains MK_{HIBE}, PP_{HIBE} by running **HIBE.Setup**(GDS_{MLM}, N, L). It also obtains $MK_{BE} = (\alpha, \gamma), PP_{BE}$ by running **PKBE.Setup**(GDS_{MLM}, N).
3. It selects a random exponent $\beta_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and saves $(\beta_\varepsilon, \gamma_\varepsilon)$ to ST_ε where $\beta_\varepsilon = \beta_{ID|_0}$ and $\gamma_\varepsilon = \gamma_{ID_0} = \gamma$. It outputs a master key $MK = \alpha$, an empty revocation list RL_ε, a state ST_ε, and public parameters

$$PP = \left(GDS_{MLM},\ PP_{HIBE},\ PP_{BE},\ g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}},\ g_2^{\beta_\varepsilon},\ \Omega = g_3^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon} \right).$$

RHIBE.GenKey($ID|_\ell, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP$): Let $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell) \in \mathcal{I}^\ell$. It proceeds as follows:

1. If a tuple $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ exist in $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then it retrieves $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ from $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. Otherwise, it selects random exponents $\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and saves $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ to $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.
2. It assigns a unique index $d_\ell \in \mathcal{N}$ to the identity $ID|_\ell$ and adds a tuple $(ID|_\ell, d_\ell)$ to $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. It obtains a private key $SK_{BE,d_\ell} = K_{BE}$ by running **PKBE.GenKey**$(d_\ell, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP_{BE})$. Next, it selects a random exponent $r_{\ell,1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level private key

$$LSK_\ell = \left(K_{\ell,0} = K_{BE} \cdot F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{-r_{\ell,1}},\ K_{\ell,1} = g_1^{-r_{\ell,1}} \right) \in \mathbb{G}_1^2.$$

3. Finally, it outputs a private key $SK_{ID|_\ell} = \left(\{d_\ell, LSK_\ell\} \right)$.

RHIBE.UpdateKey($T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, DK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, PP$): Let $DK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T} = (D_0, \{D_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1}, D_{L+1})$ where $\ell \geq 1$. It proceeds as follows:

1. It defines a revoked set $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ of user identities at time T from $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. From $R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, it defines a revoked index set $RI_{ID|_{\ell-1}} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ by using $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ since $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ contains $(ID|_\ell, d_\ell)$. After that, it defines a non-revoked index set $SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}} = \mathcal{N} \setminus RI_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.
2. It retrieves $(\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}})$ from $ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$. It obtains $CH_{BE} = (E_0, E_1)$ by running **PKBE.Encrypt** $(SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, \beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, Y_{ID|_{\ell-1}} = g_1^{\gamma_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP_{BE})$. Next, it selects a random exponent $r_{\ell-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a level update key

$$LUK_{\ell-1} = \left(U_{\ell-1,0} = E_0,\ U_{\ell-1,1} = E_1 \cdot H_1(T)^{r_{\ell-1}},\ U_{\ell-1,2} = g_1^{-r_{\ell-1}} \right) \in \mathbb{G}_1^3.$$

3. If $\ell = 1$, then $DK_{ID|_{\ell-1},T} = MK$ and creates a partial decryption key $PDK_0 = \left(P_0 = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2},\ P_{L+1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2} \right)$. Otherwise ($\ell \geq 2$), then it creates a partial decryption key

$$PDK_{\ell-1} = \left(P_0 = D_0 \cdot \left(g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}} \right)^{-\beta_{ID|_{\ell-1}}},\ \left\{ P_i = D_i \right\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1},\ P_{L+1} = D_{L+1} \right) \in \mathbb{G}_2^{\ell+2}.$$

4. Finally, it outputs an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}} = \big(PDK_{\ell-1}, \{SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, LUK_{\ell-1}\}\big)$.

RHIBE.DeriveKey($SK_{ID|_\ell}, UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}}, PP$): Let $SK_{ID|_\ell} = (\{d_\ell, LSK_\ell\})$ where $LSK_\ell = (K_0, K_1)$ and $\ell \geq 1$, and $UK_{T,R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}} = (PDK_{\ell-1}, \{SI_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, LUK_{\ell-1}\})$ where $PDK_{\ell-1} = (P_0, \{P_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1}, P_{L+1})$ and $LUK_{\ell-1} = (U_0, U_1, U_2)$. If $ID|_\ell \in R_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then it outputs $\perp$ since the identity ID_ℓ is revoked. Otherwise, it proceeds the following steps:

1. For $i = \ell$, it retrieves $\{d_i, LSK_i = (K_{i,0}, K_{i,1})\}$ and $\{SI_{ID|_{i-1}}, LUK_{i-1} = (U_{i-1,0}, U_{i-1,1}, U_{i-1,2})\}$ and computes the following components

$$A_{i,0} = e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i,1}) \cdot e_{1,1}\big(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,0} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID|_{i-1}}, j \neq d_i} X_{N+1-j+d_i}\big)^{-1},$$
$$A_{i,1} = e_{1,1}(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,1}),\ A_{i,2} = e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i-1,2}).$$

2. Next, it derives a temporal decryption key

$$TDK_{ID|_\ell,T} = \Big(D_0 = P_0 \cdot A_{\ell,0},\ \{D_i = P_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1},\ D_\ell = A_{\ell,1},\ D_{L+1} = P_{L+1} \cdot A_{\ell,2}\Big) \in \mathbb{G}_2^{\ell+2}.$$

3. Finally, it outputs a decryption key $DK_{ID|_\ell,T}$ by running **HIBE.RandKey**$(TDK_{ID|_\ell,T}, PP_{HIBE})$.

RHIBE.Encrypt($ID|_\ell, T, M, PP$): Let $ID|_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$. It first chooses a random exponent $s \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and obtains CH_{HIBE} by running **HIBE.Encrypt**$(ID|_\ell, T, s, PP_{HIBE})$. It outputs a ciphertext $CT_{ID|_\ell,T} = \big(C = \Omega^s \cdot M,\ CH_{HIBE}\big)$.

RHIBE.Decrypt($CT_{ID,T}, DK_{ID',T'}, PP$): Let $CT_{ID,T} = (C, CH_{HIBE})$. If $(ID = ID') \wedge (T = T')$, then it obtains EK_{HIBE} by running **HIBE.Decrypt**$(CH_{HIBE}, DK_{ID',T'}, PP_{HIBE})$ and outputs the message M by computing $M = C \cdot EK_{HIBE}^{-1}$. Otherwise, it outputs $\perp$.

RHIBE.Revoke($ID|_\ell, T, RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}, ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$): If $(ID|_\ell, -) \notin ST_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$, then it outputs $\perp$ since the private key of $ID|_\ell$ was not generated. Otherwise, it updates $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$ by adding $(ID|_\ell, T)$ to $RL_{ID|_{\ell-1}}$.

4.3 Correctness

Let SK_{ID_ℓ} be a private key for an identity ID_ℓ that is associated with an index $d_{ID_{\ell-1}}$, and $UK_{T,R_{ID_{\ell-1}}}$ be an update key for a time T and a revoked identity set $R_{ID_{\ell-1}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{i,0} &= EK_{BE} \cdot e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, H_1(T)^{r_i}) \cdot e_{1,1}(E_0, F_{1,i}(I_i)^{r_{i,1}}),\\
&= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_{i-1}}} \cdot H_2(T)^{\alpha^{d_i} r_i} \cdot F_{2,i}(I_i)^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,1}},\\
A_{i,1} &= e_{1,1}(U_{i-1,0}, K_{i,1}) = e_{1,1}\big(g_1^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}}}, g_1^{-r_{i,1}}\big) = g_2^{-\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,1}},\\
A_{i,2} &= e_{1,1}(X_{d_i}, U_{i-1,2}) = e_{1,1}\big(g_1^{\alpha^{d_i}}, g_1^{-r_i}\big) = g_2^{-\alpha^{d_i} r_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $ID_\ell \notin R_{ID_{\ell-1}}$, then the decryption key derivation algorithm first correctly derives temporal decryption

key as

$$
\begin{aligned}
D_0 = P_0 \cdot A_{\ell,0} &= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A_{i,0} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_i}} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID_{i-1}}} H_2(T)^{\alpha^{d_i} r_i} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,1}} \\
&= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,1}} \cdot H_1(T)^{\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha^{d_i} r_i}, \\
D_i = g_2^{-\beta_{ID_{i-1}} r_{i,1}} \quad \forall i \in [\ell],\ D_{L+1} &= P_{L+1} \cdot A_{\ell,2} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} A_{i,2} = g_2^{-\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha^{d_i} r_i}.
\end{aligned}
$$

4.4 Security Analysis

To prove the security of our RHIBE scheme via history-free approach, we carefully combine the partitioning methods of the BGW-PKBE scheme [6], the BB-HIBE scheme [3], and our cancelation technique.

Theorem 4.1. *The above RHIBE scheme is SRL-IND secure if the* $(3,N)$*-MDHE assumption holds where* N *is the maximum child number of users in the system.*

Proof. Suppose there exists an adversary $\mathcal{A}$ that attacks the above RHIBE scheme with a non-negligible advantage. A meta-simulator $\mathcal{B}$ that solves the MDHE assumption using $\mathcal{A}$ is given: a challenge tuple $D = \big((p,\mathbb{G}_1,\mathbb{G}_2,\mathbb{G}_3), g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^b, g_1^c\big)$ and Z where $Z = Z_0 = g_3^{a^{N+1}bc}$ or $Z = Z_1 \in \mathbb{G}_3$. Note that a challenge tuple $D_{BDHE} = \big((p,\mathbb{G}_1,\mathbb{G}_2), g_1, g_1^a, g_1^{a^2}, \ldots, g_1^{a^N}, g_1^{a^{N+2}}, \ldots, g_1^{a^{2N}}, g_1^b\big)$ for the BDHE assumption can be derived from the challenge tuple D of the MDHE assumption. Let $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ be the simulator in the security proof of Theorem 3.2 and $\mathcal{B}_{PKBE}$ be a simulator in security proof of Theorem 3.1. Then $\mathcal{B}$ that interacts with $\mathcal{A}$ is described as follows:

Init: $\mathcal{A}$ initially submits a challenge identity $ID^*_{\ell^*} = (I^*_1, \ldots, I^*_{\ell^*})$, a challenge time T^*, and a revoked identity set $R^* = (R^*_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, R^*_{ID^*_{\ell^*-1}})$ at the time T^*. It first sets a state ST and a revocation list RL as empty one. For each $ID \in \{ID^*\} \cup R^*$, it selects an index $d_{ID^*_x} \in \mathcal{N}_x$ such that $(-, d_{ID^*_x}) \notin ST_{ID^*_x}$ and adds $(ID, d_{ID^*_x})$ to $ST_{ID^*_x}$. Let $RI^* = (RI^*_{ID_0}, \ldots, RI^*_{ID_{\ell^*-1}}) \subseteq \mathcal{N}$ be the revoked index set of R^* at the time T^* and $SI^* = (SI^*_{ID_1}, \ldots, SI^*_{ID_{\ell^*-1}})$ be the non-revoked index set at the time T^* such that $SI^*_{ID_x} = \mathcal{N}_x \setminus RI^*_{ID_x}$.
Setup: $\mathcal{B}$ submits $ID^*_{\ell^*}$ and T^* to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ and receives PP_{HIBE}. It also submits $SI^*_{ID^*_0}$ to $\mathcal{B}_{PKBE}$ and receives PP_{PKBE}. $\mathcal{B}$ first chooses random exponents $\theta_{ID^*_0}, \ldots, \theta_{ID^*_{\ell^*-1}} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$. It implicitly sets $\alpha = a, \beta_\varepsilon = \beta_{ID_0} = b, \{\beta_{ID_i} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID_i}\}_{1 \le i \le \ell^*-1}, \{\gamma_{ID^*_x} = \theta_{ID^*_x} - \sum_{j \in SI_{ID^*_x}} a^{N+1-j}\}_{0 \le x \le \ell^*-1}$ and publishes the public parameters PP as

$$
PP = \big(PP_{HIBE},\ PP_{PKBE},\ \Omega = e\big(e(g_1^\alpha, g_1^{\alpha^N}), g_1^b\big) = g_3^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon}\big).
$$

Phase 1: $\mathcal{A}$ adaptively requests a polynomial number of private key, update key, and decryption key queries. If this is a private key query for an identity $ID_\ell = (I_1, \ldots, I_\ell)$, then $\mathcal{B}$ proceeds as follows: Note that $SK_{ID_\ell} = (\{d_\ell, LSK_\ell\})$ where $LSK_\ell = (K_{\ell,0}, K_{\ell,1})$.

- **Case** $ID_{\ell-1} \notin$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$: In this case, it can normally generate the state $ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ by himself. It first normally sets $ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ where the index $d_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ is associated with ID_ℓ. And, it selects a random exponent γ_{ID_ℓ}. It obtains SK_{ID_ℓ} by running **RHIBE.GenKey**$(ID_\ell, ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}, PP)$.

- **Case** $ID_{\ell-1} \in \textbf{Prefix}(ID^*_{\ell^*})$: In this case, it first retrieves a tuple (ID_ℓ, d_i) from $ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ where the index d_i is associated with ID_ℓ.

  - **Case** $ID_\ell \in R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$: In this case, the simulator can use the partitioning method of Boenh et al. [6]. Next, it selects a random exponent $r_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a private key SK_{ID_ℓ} as

$$LSK_\ell = \Big(K_{\ell,0} = (g_1^{a^{d_i}})^\theta (\prod_{j \in SI^*} g_1^{a^{N+1-j+d_i}})^{-1} \cdot F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{-r_\ell},\ K_{\ell,1} = g_1^{-r_\ell}\Big).$$

  - **Case** $ID_\ell \notin R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$: In this case, we have $I_\ell \neq I^*_\ell$ from the restriction of Definition 3.2 and the simulator can use the paritioning method of Boneh and Boyen [3]. It first selects an index $d_i \in \mathcal{N}_\ell$ such that $(-, d_i) \notin ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and adds (ID_ℓ, d_i) to $ST_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$. Next, it selects a random exponent $r'_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates a private key SK_{ID} by implicitly setting $r_\ell = -a/\Delta ID + r'_\ell$ as

$$LSK_\ell = \Big(K_{\ell,0} = g_1^{a^{d_i}\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus \{d_i\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_i}} (g_1^a)^{f'_0/\Delta ID} F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{r'_\ell},$$
$$K_{\ell,1} = (g_1^a)^{-1/\Delta ID} g_1^{-r'_\ell}\Big).$$

If this is an update key query for an identity $ID_{\ell-1} = (I_1, \ldots, I_{\ell-1})$ and a time T, then $\mathcal{B}$ defines a revoked identity set $R_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ at the time T from $RL_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ and proceeds as follows: Note that $UK_{T,R_{ID_{\ell-1}}} = (PDK_{\ell-1}, \{SI_{ID_{\ell-1}}, LUK_{\ell-1}\})$ where $LUK_{\ell-1} = (U_{\ell-1,0}, U_{\ell-1,1}, U_{\ell-1,2})$ and $PDK_{\ell-1} = (P_0, \{P_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1}), P_{L+1}$.

- **Case** $T \neq T^*$: It first sets a revoked index set $RI_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ of $R_{ID_{\ell-1}}$ by using $ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}$. It also sets $SI_{ID_{\ell-1}} = \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus RI_{ID_{\ell-1}}$. And, it also sets $SI_{ID_{\ell-1}} = \mathcal{N}_1 \setminus RI_{ID_{\ell-1}}$.

  - **Case** $ID_{\ell-1} = ID_0$: In this case, the simultor can use the partitioning method of Boneh and Boyen [3]. It selects a random exponent $r'_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates an update key $UK_{T,R}$ by implicitly setting $r_0 = -(-\sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID_0} \setminus SI_{ID_0}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j \in SI_{ID_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID_0}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_0$ as

$$LUK_{\ell-1} = \Big(U_{\ell-1,0} = g_1^b,$$
$$U_{\ell-1,1} = (g_1^b)^{\theta_{ID_0}} \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID_0} \setminus SI_{ID_0}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_0},$$
$$U_{\ell-1,2} = \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID_0} \setminus SI_{ID_0}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_0}\Big),$$
$$PDK_{\ell-1} = \Big(P_0 = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2},\ P_{L+1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2}\Big).$$

  - **Case** $ID_{\ell-1} \in \textbf{Prefix}(ID^*_{\ell^*})$: In this case, the simulator can use the partitioning method of Boneh and Boyen [3] to create a level update key, and the cancelation technique by using the session key of PKBE to create a partial decryption key. It selects a random exponent $r'_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates an update key $UK_{T,R}$ by implicitly setting $r_0 = -(-\sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID_0} \setminus SI_{ID_0}} a^{N+1-j} +$

$\sum_{j\in SI_{ID_0}\setminus SI^*_{ID_0}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_0$ as

$$LUK_{\ell-1} = \Big(U_{\ell-1,0} = g_1^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}},$$
$$U_{\ell-1,1} = (g_1^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}})^{\theta_{ID_{\ell-1}}} \Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}\setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}\setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}}$$
$$\times \Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{\ell-1}}\setminus SI_{ID_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_{\ell-1}}\setminus SI^*_{ID_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_0},$$
$$U_{\ell-1,2} = \Big(\prod_{j\in SI^*_{ID_{\ell-1}}\setminus SI_{ID_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j\in SI_{ID_{\ell-1}}\setminus SI^*_{ID_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_0}\Big),$$
$$PDK_{\ell-1} = \Big(P_0 = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i}\cdot H(T)^{r_0}\cdot e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}},\ \{P_i = g_2^{r_i}\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1},\ P_{L+1} = g_2^{r_{L+1}}\Big).$$

– **Case** $ID_{\ell-1}\notin$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$: In this case, the simulator can obtain the decryption key $DK_{ID_{\ell-1},T} = (D_0,\ldots,D_{\ell-1},D_{L+1})$ by requesting an RHIBE decryption key query. Next, it can nomally create an update key by running **RHIBE.UpdateKey** $(T, RL_{ID_{\ell-1}}, DK_{ID_{\ell-1},T}, ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}, PP)$.

- **Case** $T = T^*$: For each $ID\in R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$, it adds (ID,T^*) to $RL_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ if $(ID,T')\notin RL_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ for any $T'\le T^*$.

  – **Case** $ID_{\ell-1} = ID_0$: In this case, the simulator can use the partitioning method of Boneh et al. [6]. It selects random exponent $r_0\in\mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates an update key $UK_{T,R_{ID_{\ell-1}}}$ as

$$LUK_{\ell-1} = \Big(U_{\ell-1,0} = g_1^b,\ U_{\ell-1,1} = (g_1^b)^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}}\cdot H_1(T^*)^{r_0},\ U_{\ell-1,2} = g_1^{-r_0}\Big),$$
$$PDK_{\ell-1} = \Big(P_0 = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2},\ P_{L+1} = 1_{\mathbb{G}_2}\Big).$$

  – **Case** $ID_{\ell-1}\in$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$: In this case, the simulator can use the partitioning method of Boneh et al. [6]. It selects random exponents $r_0,\ldots,r_{\ell-1},r_{L+1}\in\mathbb{Z}_p$ and creates an update key $UK_{T,R}$ as

$$LUK_{\ell-1} = \Big(U_{\ell-1,0} = g_1^b\cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}},\ U_{\ell-1,1} = (g_1^b\cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}})^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} H_1(T^*)^{r_0},\ U_{\ell-1,2} = g_1^{-r_0}\Big),$$
$$PDK_{\ell-1} = \Big(P_0 = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i}\cdot H(T)^{r_0}\cdot e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}},\ \{P_i = g_2^{r_i}\}_{i=1}^{\ell-1},\ P_{L+1} = g_2^{r_{L+1}}\Big).$$

  – **Case** $ID_{\ell-1}\notin$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$: In this case, the simulator can obtain the decryption key $DK_{ID_{\ell-1},T} = (D_0,\ldots,D_{\ell-1},D_{L+1})$ by requesting an RHIBE decryption key query. Next, it can nomally create an update key by running **RHIBE.UpdateKey** $(T, RL_{ID_{\ell-1}}, DK_{ID_{\ell-1},T}, ST_{ID_{\ell-1}}, PP)$.

If this is a decryption key query for an identity $ID = (I_1,\ldots,I_\ell)$ and a time T, then $\mathcal{B}$ proceeds as follows: It requests an HIBE private key for ID and T to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ and receives $SK_{HIBE,ID,T}$. Next, it sets the decryption key $DK_{ID,T} = SK_{HIBE,ID,T}$.

Challenge: $\mathcal{A}$ submits two challenge messages M^*_0, M^*_1. $\mathcal{B}$ chooses a random bit $\delta\in\{0,1\}$ and proceed as follows: It requests the challenge ciphertext for ID^* and T^* to $\mathcal{B}_{HIBE}$ and receives CH_{HIBE,ID^*,T^*}. Next, it

sets the challenge ciphertext $CT_{ID^*,T^*} = (Z \cdot M^*_\delta, CH_{HIBE,ID^*,T^*})$.

Phase 2: Same as Phase 1.

Guess: Finally, $\mathcal{A}$ outputs a guess $\delta' \in \{0,1\}$. $\mathcal{B}$ outputs 0 if $\delta = \delta'$ or 1 otherwise. □

Lemma 4.2. *The distribution of the above simulation is correct if $Z = Z_0$, and the challenge ciphertext is independent of δ in the adversary's view if $Z = Z_1$.*

Proof. We show that the distribution of private keys is correct. In case of $ID_\ell \in R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and $ID_{\ell-1} \in$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$, we have that the private key is correctly distributed from the setting $\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j}$ as the following equation

$$K_{\ell,0} = g_1^{a^{d_\ell}\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \cdot F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{-r_\ell} = g_1^{a^{d_\ell}(\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j})} = (g_1^{a^{d_\ell}})^\theta (\prod_{j \in SI^*} g_1^{a^{N+1-j+d_\ell}})^{-1} \cdot F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{-r_\ell}.$$

In case of $ID_\ell \notin R^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and $ID_{\ell-1} \in$ **Prefix**$(ID^*_{\ell^*})$, we have that the private key is correctly distributed from the setting $\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j}$ and $r_\ell = -a/\Delta I_\ell + r'_\ell$ as the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{\ell,0} &= g_1^{\alpha^{d_\ell}\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{-r_\ell} = g_1^{a^{d_\ell}\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g^{-a^{N+1-j+d_\ell}} \big(f_{1,0} \prod_{i=1}^{l} f_{1,i,I_1[i]}\big)^{-r_\ell} \\
&= g_1^{a^{d_\ell}\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus \{d_\ell\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_\ell}} \cdot g_1^{-a^{N+1}} \big(g_1^{f'_0} g_1^{a^N \Delta I_\ell}\big)^{a/\Delta I_\ell - r'_\ell} \\
&= g_1^{a^{d_\ell}\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus \{d_\ell\}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j+d_\ell}} (g_1^a)^{f'_0/\Delta I_\ell} F_{1,\ell}(I_\ell)^{-r'_\ell}, \\
K_{\ell,1} &= g_1^{r_\ell} = (g_1^a)^{-1/\Delta I_\ell} g_1^{r'_\ell}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we show that the distribution of update keys is correct. In case of $ID_{\ell-1} = ID_0$ and $T \neq T^*$, we have that the update key is correctly distributed from the setting $\beta_{ID^*_0} = b$, $\gamma_{ID^*_0} = \theta_{ID^*_0} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0}} a^{N+1-j}$ and $r_0 = -(-\sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI_{ID^*_0}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j \in SI_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_0}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_0$ as the following equation

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{\ell-1,1} =& \big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID^*_0}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_0}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID^*_0}} H_1(T)^{r_{1,0}} = \Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID^*_0}} (\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}})^{-1} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^b \big(h_{1,0} \prod_{i=1}^{t} h_{1,i,T[i]}\big)^{r_{1,0}} \\
=& (g_1^b)^{\theta_{ID^*_0}} \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \Big)^b \\
& \times \big(g_1^{h'_0} g_1^{b\Delta T}\big)^{-(-\sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI_{ID^*_0}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j \in SI_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_0}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_{1,0}} \\
=& (g_1^b)^{\theta_{ID^*_0}} \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \Big)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_{1,0}}, \\
U_{\ell-1,2} =& g_1^{r_{1,0}} = \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_0} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}} \Big)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_{1,0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

In case of $ID_{\ell-1} \in \mathbf{Prefix}(ID^*_{\ell^*})$ and $T \neq T^*$, we have that the update key is correctly distributed from the setting $\beta_{ID_{\ell-1}} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}$, $\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j}$ and $r_0 = -(-\sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_0$ as the following equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{\ell-1,1} =& \big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} H_1(T)^{r_0} \\
=& \Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\big)^{-1} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}} \big(h_{1,0} \prod_{i=1}^{t} h_{1,i,T[i]}\big)^{r_0} \\
=& (g_1^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}})^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}} \\
& \times \big(g_1^{h'_0} g_1^{b\Delta T}\big)^{-(-\sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j} + \sum_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j})/\Delta T + r'_0} \\
=& (g_1^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}})^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{\hat{\beta}_{ID_{\ell-1}}} \\
& \times \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-h'_0/\Delta T} H_1(T)^{r'_0}, \\
U_{\ell-1,2} =& g_1^{r_0} = \Big(\prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{-a^{N+1-j}} \prod_{j \in SI_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} \setminus SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{-1/\Delta T} g_1^{r'_0}, \\
P_0 =& g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \\
=& g_2^{a^{N+1}b} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot g_2^{-a^{N+1}(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}})} \\
=& \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot g_2^{-a^{N+1}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In case of $ID_{\ell-1} = ID_0$ and $T = T^*$, we have that the update key is correctly distributed from the setting $\beta_{ID^*_0} = b$ and $\gamma_{ID^*_0} = \theta_{ID^*_0} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID_0}} a^{N+1-j}$ as the following equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{\ell-1,1} =& \big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID^*_0}} \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\big)^{\beta_{ID^*_0}} \cdot H_1(T^*)^{r_2} \\
=& \Big(g_1^{\theta_{ID^*_0}} \big(\prod_{j \in SI^* ID^*_0} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\big)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_0}} g_1^{a^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{b} H_1(T^*)^{r_2} = (g_1^b)^{\theta} H_1(T^*)^{r_2}.
\end{aligned}
$$

In case of $ID_{\ell-1} \in \mathbf{Prefix}(ID^*_{\ell^*})$ and $T = T^*$, we have that the update key is correctly distributed from the

setting $\beta_\varepsilon = b$, $\beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} = b + \hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}$ and $\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} = \theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}} - \sum_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} a^{N+1-j}$ as the following equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{\ell-1,1} &= \Big(g_1^{\gamma_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} \prod_{j \in SI^*_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} g_1^{\alpha^{N+1-j}}\Big)^{\beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} H_1(T)^{\hat{r}_0} = \big(g_1^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}}\big)^{b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} H_1(T)^{\hat{r}_0} \\
&= \big(g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}}\big)^{\theta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} H_1(T^*)^{\hat{r}_0},\ U_{\ell-1,2} = g_1^{\beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} = g_1^b \cdot g_1^{\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}}, \\
P_0 &= g_2^{\alpha^{N+1}\beta_\varepsilon} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot g_2^{-\alpha^{N+1}\beta_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} = g_2^{a^{N+1}b} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot g_2^{-a^{N+1}(b+\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}})} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot g_2^{-a^{N+1}\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} F_{2,i}(I_i)^{r_i} \cdot H(T)^{r_0} \cdot e(g_1^a, g_1^{a^N})^{-\hat{\beta}_{ID^*_{\ell-1}}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Otherwise, the component C of the challenge ciphertext is independent of δ in the $\mathcal{A}$'s view since Z_1 is a random element in $\mathbb{G}_3$. This completes our proof. □

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we first proposed an RHIBE scheme via history-preserving updates with $O(\ell)$ number of private key elements and update key elements by combining the BB-HIBE scheme and the BGW-PKBE scheme. Next, we proposed another RHIBE scheme via history-free updates that reduces the number of private key elements from $O(\ell)$ to $O(1)$. An interesting open problem is to build an adaptive secure RHIBE scheme with $O(\ell)$ number of private key elements and update key elements. Another one is to construct an RHIBE scheme with $O(\ell)$ number of private key elements and update key elements that can handle exponential number of users in the system.

References

[1] Martin R. Albrecht, Pooya Farshim, Dennis Hofheinz, Enrique Larraia, and Kenneth G. Paterson. Multilinear maps from obfuscation. In Eyal Kushilevitz and Tal Malkin, editors, *Theory of Cryptography - TCC 2016-A*, volume 9562 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 446–473. Springer, 2016.

[2] Alexandra Boldyreva, Vipul Goyal, and Virendra Kumar. Identity-based encryption with efficient revocation. In Peng Ning, Paul F. Syverson, and Somesh Jha, editors, *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 417–426. ACM, 2008.

[3] Dan Boneh and Xavier Boyen. Efficient selective-id secure identity-based encryption without random oracles. In Christian Cachin and Jan Camenisch, editors, *EUROCRYPT 2004*, volume 3027 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 223–238. Springer, 2004.

[4] Dan Boneh, Xavier Boyen, and Eu-Jin Goh. Hierarchical identity based encryption with constant size ciphertext. In Ronald Cramer, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2005*, volume 3494 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 440–456. Springer, 2005.

[5] Dan Boneh and Matthew K. Franklin. Identity-based encryption from the weil pairing. In Joe Kilian, editor, *CRYPTO 2001*, volume 2139 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 213–229. Springer, 2001.

[6] Dan Boneh, Craig Gentry, and Brent Waters. Collusion resistant broadcast encryption with short ciphertexts and private keys. In Victor Shoup, editor, *CRYPTO 2005*, volume 3621 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 258–275. Springer, 2005.

[7] Dan Boneh and Alice Silverberg. Applications of multilinear forms to cryptography. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 324:71–90, 2003.

[8] Xavier Boyen and Brent Waters. Anonymous hierarchical identity-based encryption (without random oracles). In Cynthia Dwork, editor, *Advances in Cryptology - CRYPTO 2006*, volume 4117 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 290–307. Springer, 2006.

[9] Jung Hee Cheon, Pierre-Alain Fouque, Changmin Lee, Brice Minaud, and Hansol Ryu. Cryptanalysis of the new clt multilinear map over the integers. In Marc Fischlin and Jean-Sébastien Coron, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2016*, volume 9665 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 509–536. Springer, 2016.

[10] Jung Hee Cheon, Kyoohyung Han, Changmin Lee, Hansol Ryu, and Damien Stehlé. Cryptanalysis of the multilinear map over the integers. In Elisabeth Oswald and Marc Fischlin, editors, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2015*, volume 9056 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 3–12. Springer, 2015.

[11] Sanjam Garg, Craig Gentry, and Shai Halevi. Candidate multilinear maps from ideal lattices. In Thomas Johansson and Phong Q. Nguyen, editors, *EUROCRYPT 2013*, volume 7881 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–17. Springer, 2013.

[12] Craig Gentry. Practical identity-based encryption without random oracles. In Serge Vaudenay, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2006*, volume 4004 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 445–464. Springer, 2006.

[13] Craig Gentry and Shai Halevi. Hierarchical identity based encryption with polynomially many levels. In Omer Reingold, editor, *Theory of Cryptography - TCC 2009*, volume 5444 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 437–456. Springer, 2009.

[14] Craig Gentry and Alice Silverberg. Hierarchical id-based cryptography. In Yuliang Zheng, editor, *ASIACRYPT 2002*, volume 2501 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 548–566. Springer, 2002.

[15] Jeremy Horwitz and Ben Lynn. Toward hierarchical identity-based encryption. In Lars R. Knudsen, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2002*, volume 2332 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 466–481. Springer, 2002.

[16] Kwangsu Lee, Dong Hoon Lee, and Jong Hwan Park. Efficient revocable identity-based encryption via subset difference methods. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2014/132, 2014. `http://eprint.iacr.org/2014/132`.

[17] Kwangsu Lee, Jong Hwan Park, and Dong Hoon Lee. Anonymous hibe with short ciphertexts: full security in prime order groups. *Designs Codes Cryptogr.*, 74(2):395–425, 2015.

[18] Kwangsu Lee and Seunghwan Park. Revocable hierarchical identity-based encryption with shorter private keys and update keys. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2016/460, 2016. `http://eprint.iacr.org/2016/460`.

[19] Allison B. Lewko and Brent Waters. Unbounded hibe and attribute-based encryption. In Kenneth G. Paterson, editor, *Advances in Cryptology - EUROCRYPT 2011*, volume 6632 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 547–567. Springer, 2011.

[20] Benoît Libert and Damien Vergnaud. Adaptive-id secure revocable identity-based encryption. In Marc Fischlin, editor, *CT-RSA 2009*, volume 5473 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1–15. Springer, 2009.

[21] Dalit Naor, Moni Naor, and Jeffery Lotspiech. Revocation and tracing schemes for stateless receivers. In Joe Kilian, editor, *CRYPTO 2001*, volume 2139 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 41–62. Springer, 2001.

[22] Seunghwan Park, Kwangsu Lee, and Dong Hoon Lee. New constructions of revocable identity-based encryption from multilinear maps. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Forensic Secur.*, 10(8):1564–1577, 2015.

[23] Geumsook Ryu, Kwangsu Lee, Seunghwan Park, and Dong Hoon Lee. Unbounded hierarchical identity-based encryption with efficient revocation. In *Information Security Applications - WISA 2015*, volume 9503 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 122–133. Springer, 2015.

[24] Amit Sahai and Brent Waters. Fuzzy identity-based encryption. In Ronald Cramer, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2005*, volume 3494 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 457–473. Springer, 2005.

[25] Jae Hong Seo and Keita Emura. Efficient delegation of key generation and revocation functionalities in identity-based encryption. In Ed Dawson, editor, *CT-RSA 2013*, volume 7779 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 343–358. Springer, 2013.

[26] Jae Hong Seo and Keita Emura. Revocable identity-based encryption revisited: Security model and construction. In Kaoru Kurosawa and Goichiro Hanaoka, editors, *PKC 2013*, volume 7778 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 216–234. Springer, 2013.

[27] Jae Hong Seo and Keita Emura. Revocable hierarchical identity-based encryption: History-free update, security against insiders, and short ciphertexts. In Kaisa Nyberg, editor, *Topics in Cryptology - CT-RSA 2015*, volume 9048 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 106–123. Springer, 2015.

[28] Adi Shamir. Identity-based cryptosystems and signature schemes. In G. R. Blakley and David Chaum, editors, *CRYPTO '84*, volume 196 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 47–53. Springer, 1984.

[29] Brent Waters. Efficient identity-based encryption without random oracles. In Ronald Cramer, editor, *EUROCRYPT 2005*, volume 3494 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 114–127. Springer, 2005.

[30] Brent Waters. Dual system encryption: Realizing fully secure ibe and hibe under simple assumptions. In Shai Halevi, editor, *CRYPTO 2009*, volume 5677 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 619–636. Springer, 2009.